

Appendix

Disabled American Veterans' Code of Ethics for National Guild of Attorneys in Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, over the years the Disabled American Veterans have steadfastly concentrated upon service to its members who have been disabled in the military service and upon legislation to assist these veterans, their widows and dependents. The Disabled American Veterans maintain a national staff of national service officers assigned to each regional office of the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of assisting applicants in the presentation of their claims for the benefits which Congress has given them. In this respect these national service officers are attorneys in fact.

Throughout the years they have adopted a code of ethics as a standard of conduct among themselves by which they could live and work for the benefit of all of our disabled veterans and their dependents. However, for the first time they have reduced this to writing and set forth their dedication to the cause of the disabled.

As a member of this great organization I take pride in calling the attention of my colleagues to this code of ethics and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. There being no objection, the code was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE VII—CODE OF ETHICS FOR NATIONAL GUILD OF ATTORNEYS IN FACT, THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

I. PREAMBLE

As the basis for this code of ethics, we refer to and adopt the statement contained in the published report of the Attorney General's Office of the United States, filed April 22, 1940, as authorized by Senate Resolution 248, under which authority the administrative procedures in Government agencies were investigated by a group of the Nation's most prominent lawyers, and which report included the Veterans' Administration. The report, speaking of representation by the Disabled American Veterans, and others, in part states:

"Their representative staffs are ordinarily headed by a chief lawyer; there are medical consultants on the service-organization staff. Most of the actual representation of claimants before the various Administration boards, however, is performed by nonlawyers, experienced in matters pertaining to veterans' affairs. The result has been a salutary one: Representation is expert, nontechnical, and aware of the precise issues. The service organization representatives devote

their full-time to the task of serving claimants, and their performances, thus far observed, have been of the highest caliber. It is apparent that the individual case is thoroughly studied and the facts, no matter how detailed and medical in form, well learned. Aided by intimate knowledge of the methods of the Administration, the service-organization representatives have developed an able specialized bar.

"Finally, the service organizations, through intimate contact with the Administration, play an important part in shaping its policies. Conferences between service organizations and Administration officials regarding not only individual cases and individual personnel but the broad problems of management and procedure are constant. The organizations are alert to detect vagaries of policy and are not reluctant immediately to attempt correction. The administration of veterans' laws in its broadest aspects, in brief, is, in practice, the result of the mutual efforts of the Administration itself and of the service organizations."

Thus, this investigative group of the U.S. Government has characterized our attorneys in fact of the Disabled American Veterans as an able specialized bar.

II. PURPOSE OF ETHICS

Section 1, to dignify the profession: With the creation of the National Guild of Attorneys in Fact, the Disabled American Veterans, for the purpose of setting up goals to more firmly and adequately establish our service as a calling which merits recognition as a profession, it becomes necessary to adopt a code of ethics. The professional man governs himself by a code of ethics. This is true of law, medicine, theology, and the military, and the scope of our work embraces and encompasses not only those professions but the humanities as well.

Section 2, the practical purpose: The rules we seek to define are not rules for their own sake, but for the practical purpose of discovering and applying the norms and rules of right reason and right conduct in the profession to which we dedicate our lives day by day in representing the disabled war veterans, his widow and orphan before the U.S. Veterans' Administration and/or other governmental agencies through which they may seek entitlement to benefits. Ethics is both a science and an art. As a science, ethics tells us what acts are good and which are bad, in an easy and effective manner. Ethics fulfill the function of science by discovering the truth, and as an art by translating that truth into our conduct and our actions.

III. THE RULES OF ETHICS

No code or set of rules can be framed, which will specify all the duties and responsibilities of the DAV—attorney in fact who is officially recognized and authorized by the Veterans' Administration to represent claimants before this agency of the Federal Government. It involves his professional conduct toward the veteran and/or his dependent, and toward the members of the rating boards before whom he must represent the rights of the claimant to the best of his ability in presenting both the facts of service, disability, and the law applicable to the individual case. The following rules of ethics are adopted as a general guide, yet the enumeration of particular duties should not be construed as a denial of the existence

of others equally important, though not specifically mentioned:

Rule 1: The attorney in fact shall endeavor at all times to follow the highest moral principles both as a person and in his conduct with those he serves, as well as with the employees and officials of the Veterans' Administration—his reputation for honesty, integrity, and fair dealing should always be of the highest quality.

Rule 2: The relationship of attorney in fact and claimant is by law and VA regulation made confidential, and this confidential relationship must at all times be guarded and protected, and it continues on even after the case is no longer active, and it applies with equal force to the clerical staff of his office.

Rule 3: The attorney in fact has a continuing duty to further his education and training on a day-to-day basis by keeping current with the new laws, regulations, and VA interpretations, as well as the instructions and information on rating policy released by the DAV national director of claims.

Rule 4: The attorney in fact in assisting the veteran should be completely thorough in ascertaining both from the veteran and his official records, each and all of the rating issues arising out of disease or disability incurred in service, and by carefully analyzing, developing, and presenting the circumstances of military service, and the facts of disability in service, and/or those which may have arisen as secondary disabilities, and then properly plead, allege, and raise each and all of the rating issues for diagnostic investigation, and rating evaluation. Disabilities not properly diagnosed, can never be properly rated.

Rule 5: It is not only proper but it is the duty of the attorney in fact to request a rating board to explain all or any part of a rating which is still unsigned and in the work-sheet stage. The rating issues can be discussed here again or a request filed to defer the rating for the purpose of submitting additional new and material evidence. Timing is most important and a rating should never be signed off when it does not do full justice to the veteran, since he may have lost his opportunity to have the issue properly decided.

Rule 6: Part of the duties and functions of an attorney in fact before the Veterans' Administration is to clarify rating and adjudication problems, and the important task of cutting through redtape to expedite action, and release money awards, particularly in hardship cases.

Rule 7: The attorney in fact is duty bound to participate in all staff meetings called by the Veterans' Administration, and to further inspire and request such meetings whenever there exists a problem relating to policy and VA procedure that may need to be changed or modified to carry out the basic laws and regulations and our joint mission of efficient service to the claimant.

Rule 8: There is a duty falling upon the attorney in fact to formally protest any report of examination or hospital report for rating purposes where on its face the report appears to be incomplete, defective and inadequate under the standards of the VA for rating consideration, and there is apparent some indication that it did not cover the "whole man," so that an important rating issue is omitted, and it has all the earmarks

of being hurriedly made by the examiner or the veteran may have reported his dissatisfaction and a lack of sympathetic treatment during the examination. Hurried examination often lends itself to carelessness, and this may deprive the veteran of an adequate and complete diagnostic investigation for rating action.

Rule 9: It is not considered ethical for an attorney in fact to solicit a veteran to change his power of attorney from another organization to this one. The veteran should be referred to the organization which already holds his power of attorney without criticism. In event the veteran is a member of this organization, and requests that we undertake to represent him, then there exists a duty to do so. Neither is it considered ethical for one DAV—attorney in fact to make overtures or extend to a veteran impressions that he might possibly do a better job than his own DAV associate who has had the management of the case in the past. It is desirable practice in offices where there are more than one DAV—attorney in fact that the office procedure be adjusted to enable the veteran to be served from time to time by the same accredited representative. This saves time, and builds for greater confidence as between attorney in fact and claimant.

Rule 10: Candor and fairness should be the outstanding attributes of the DAV—attorney in fact. Once rapport and understanding of the claimant's case is accomplished, he should represent the claimant's viewpoint but keep in mind that by reason of his training and experience, the attorney in fact is expected to help and contribute his knowledge by assisting and directing the management of the claimant's case in such a manner that all facts and rating issues will be developed and presented.

Rule 11: Recently, there has been initiated a movement, now rapidly spreading throughout the United States, whereby joint committees of county and State bar associations, and their corresponding medical associations, have adopted an interprofessional code. One such joint code states: "This interprofessional code constitutes the further recognition that with the great developments in the science and art of both medicine and law, it is inevitable that the physician and the attorney are drawn into increasing association, as the law calls with increasing frequency upon medicine for its scientific knowledge, and for its evaluation of facts so that the rights of individuals and of the Government may be appropriately determined before various tribunals."

Thus, these joint committees of medical and bar associations are defining and agreeing to be bound by general principles as to the duty the physician owes to his client to furnish evidence involving medical facts to the client's lawyer, and the duties owed by the lawyer to both the physician and their mutual client for whom they have each a professional duty to serve. Therefore, it is the duty of the DAV—attorney in fact through contacts with both the bar and medical associations in his particular area, and to the individual members thereof, and to point out the obligation which doctors particularly owe to the disabled veterans of our wars to furnish full and complete statements when required by their clients for use before the U.S. Veterans' Administration in keeping with the facts of disability, treatment, and their professional evaluation of the disabilities, and without bias or prejudice against the Veterans' Administration as a Government agency.

Rule 12: The procedure of the Veterans' Administration provides that a claimant may have a hearing, either informally or a recorded formal hearing before regional rating boards for determination of issues there,

or on appeal to the Boards of Veterans' Appeals in event the case justifies such action. The DAV—attorney in fact—has a duty where the individual case warrants such action, to arrange to conduct such hearings if they will contribute factual information to the record upon which the case can be more equitably and properly decided. The burden of proof is on the claimant to establish his claim by a fair preponderance of all the evidence. The DAV—attorney in fact—should be prepared to conduct first the direct examination with proper questions to the veteran and his witnesses, and later to summarize the evidence, and draw reasonable conclusions therefrom in support of the veteran's contentions, after the rating board members have finished their cross-examination to test the probative value of the evidence. Here the DAV—attorney in fact—must possess that ability of a trial advocate, and with poise and dignity, and firmness in the right, as God gives him to see the right.

As Hoffman's resolutions so well state: "Nothing is more unfriendly to the art of pleasing than morbid timidity (bashfulness—mauvaise honte). All life teems with examples of its prejudicial influence, showing that the art of rising in life has no greater enemy than this senseless defect of education. Self-possession, calmness—steady assurance—intrepidity—are all perfectly consistent with the most amiable modesty, and none but vulgar and illiterate minds are prone to attribute to presumptuous assurance the apparently cool and unconcerned exertions of young men at the bar—they who bear the white banner of modesty, fringed with resolution."

The Fulbright Memorandum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, many thinking Americans are concerned over recent action taken by the Defense Department as a result of the Fulbright memorandum. Not alone are Members of the House and Senate concerned but a great swell of opinion is growing throughout the country in protest to the allegations made in this memorandum.

Typical of the feeling in the country is a statement vigorously condemning the contentions of Senator FULBRIGHT, issued by the Committee on Anti-Communist Activities of Omaha Post No. 1, American Legion. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report from the Omaha World-Herald on the action of this fine American Legion post:

LEGION POST 1 STATES STAND—CONDEMNNS FULBRIGHT MEMO ON OFFICERS

Omaha Post No. 1, American Legion, Tuesday condemned the memorandum in which Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, charged that some armed services commanders are "right-wing radicals."

The post issued a statement vigorously condemning the contentions of Senator FULBRIGHT. Its recently activated committee on anti-Communist activities stated:

"Senator FULBRIGHT falls into the Communist trap of terming anticommunism on the part of military personnel as the education of the public on political issues."

The report said that on the basis of intimate contact of Post No. 1 with the regular military establishments the post recognizes that the officer corps is composed of highly trained, intelligent, educated, and dedicated personnel.

The Price of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following for the right and truthful editorial which appeared in the Pilot, Boston, Mass., on September 2, 1961:

THE PRICE OF PEACE

It sounds like a strange thing to be talking about disarmament when the Soviet announces new nuclear tests and war itself is mentioned on the lips of more than a few people. But the subject cannot be very far from our minds and the longing of our hearts even though the moment may appear to be an unfavorable one. It is today during which we plan for tomorrow.

The Congress at the present time has had several bills introduced, notably one sponsored by the administration, which would set up a permanent Government disarmament agency for world peace and security. Although the matter has come up a few times before, it has never been able to gather enough interest to become law. Perhaps the very urgency of these days can help us to understand its present necessity and its future possibility.

If there is any hope that we will see in our lifetimes even a kind of international quiet which we can call peace, it will have to come by way of disarmament and positive peace policy. The United States has been serious, certainly, in its aims for world peace; we are not an aggressor nation and our people do not accept readily the ways of war. We are not however a supine people who shy from war when the alternative is servitude; we can fight and we can win, as history demonstrates. All the same, our preference is peace.

With this commitment made we must be prepared to work as positively and as powerfully for peace, as we have in the past, when the times required it, worked at war. We do not have, however, any real machinery for peace, anyone researching the possibilities and probabilities of peace, anyone seeking out the ways of winning peace, anyone organizing the friends of peace, and so on. What a new agency in Government would do for us would be to find realistic ways to bring about a reduction in armaments, to find formulas which would protect the national interest and at the same time promote the cause of peace.

Some people are bound to say that the establishment of a disarmament agency means that we are selling out to the opposition, that we are adopting some modified pacifism as a national policy. Nothing could be farther from the truth. What we will demonstrate to the world, however, is that the United States, first among all the nations, has set up in its official Government pattern a serious effort at a policy of peace. An effective disarmament agency will not mean that we are willing to settle for peace at any price; but it will show that we are not afraid to pay the price of peace.

Farmer-Grocer Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an interesting example of cooperation between the men who grow our food and those who sell it recently came to my attention. It was outlined in an article in *Advance News*, a publication widely circulated in the food field by *Family Circle* magazine.

The article was written by Mr. William Golub, president of Central Markets, Inc., of Schenectady, N.Y. The grower-distributor program of Central Markets, a 21-store food chain in my State, is a simple but effective plan which has brought economic benefits to farmers and also enabled the retailer to do a better job of serving consumers.

Mr. Golub is a leader in his community and an active member of the National Association of Food Chains, which sponsors nationally a farmer-retailer marketing program. I ask unanimous consent to have this article, which appeared in the September issue of *Advance News*, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROCER AND FARMER GET TOGETHER

(By William Golub, president, Central Markets, Inc., Schenectady, N.Y.)

Bringing to customers finest quality produce and at the same time helping the local economy by providing a consistent market for homegrown products are the twin objectives of the grower-distributor program of Central Markets, Inc. The result—more efficient, successful growers and greater volume and earnings for the distributor.

This matter of obtaining top quality produce from local farmers has been a problem for multiple store operators. It also has caused dissatisfaction among growers who have not been successful in selling their produce to stores in their own area at a fair price—all too frequently resulting in poor public relations, grist for the political mill, and Government investigations.

There are many advantages to procurement of produce right in the area in which stores are located. By cutting down time and distance from point of production to the retail store, produce that is more truly "garden-fresh" can be offered to the consumer. Furthermore, by buying produce locally, the retailer can help pump money back into the local economy, with both economic and public relations benefits.

Yet, despite these advantages, food retailers have been going further and further afield to obtain a number of fresh produce items that could be grown locally.

The reason for this has been that in so many local producing areas the growers have not offered produce that would measure up to the chain's quality standards and the quantities required to supply a number of stores. Frequently the pack, the containers, lack of controls in harvesting, etc., used by local growers have not been satisfactory for warehouse handling and delivery to the retail outlets. The basic ingredients for mutually satisfactory business dealings are,

and always were, there—the only difficulty has been that no one seriously made a persistent effort to correct the shortcomings.

Nevertheless, it concerned me greatly that as our company grew in size, we tended to go to greater and greater distances in order to supply our produce needs.

We gave a great deal of thought as to how we might work with local farmers so they could not only produce the kind of products that our customers wanted, but that would also meet our requirements as to controls, pack, grade, size, and quality. All too often a grower produced a fine quality product but due to lack of controls and other reasons, it did not reach the consumer in that top quality condition.

We talked with men from the State Department of Agriculture and representatives of the extension service at the State College at Cornell and received their assurances of interest and support, along with many helpful ideas and suggestions on how a grower-distributor program could be developed.

About 10 years ago we decided to make a start and selected eggs as the locally produced commodity with which we would start the program. We were not satisfied with the quality of the eggs we were handling at that time. They were often shipped to us from distant points and frequently did not meet our own standards or those of the State egg inspection service. As a result, our egg sales were not what we felt they should be.

With the help of the Department of Agriculture and the extension service we located a poultryman who was interested in working with us. We explained our requirements and he agreed to produce, handle, candle, and carton eggs the way we wanted and deliver them to our retail stores.

Our customers were pleased with the better product we were able to offer them and our egg sales began climbing. Now we have 10 poultrymen supplying eggs according to our specifications for all our 21 retail stores. We pay a premium price for these premium quality eggs—high enough to cover the extra costs of production and handling and give the poultrymen a profit.

With the soundness of our idea proved by the success with eggs we gradually expanded the program to vegetables and some fruits. We work closely with our growers keeping them informed as to our requirements and needs. They, in turn, cooperate closely with us, always striving to improve their controls, quality, grade and pack.

We believe we have been of real help to local growers in adapting themselves to the merchandising procedures of the modern supermarket. We believe we have aided in making them successful, purposeful businessmen.

We demand high quality and we pay for it. We don't try to put the squeeze on our local growers for lower prices in case of a temporary surplus, but instead try to help them move out the extra supply at a fair price.

This has not only been a good deal for the growers, but it's also a good deal for us and for our customers. Because our produce is now fresher, we have less spoilage in the stores. The produce stays fresh longer on the stands because proper controls have been exercised and it has spent less time in transit. The quality and freshness we can offer have increased our produce sales volume.

I'm a firm believer in the free enterprise system. To me, it seems that in order to maintain this system and enjoy its benefits, everyone must share in the responsibility for providing a healthy business climate in the area in which he does business. We profit directly by making it possible for the grower to get a better price for his product, because he in turn gives us consistently top quality which, because of

greater customer satisfaction and lesser shrinkage, results in greater volume and earnings for us.

We benefit indirectly from the additional money put into circulation. Also there is a great deal of satisfaction to all of us at Central Markets in feeling that we are trying to be a friend to our farmer neighbors. We are indebted to them for their cooperation and for the good will they have expressed toward us.

Many agricultural organization officials and publications have commended us for pioneering a practical, simple, down-to-earth program that could go a long way toward building lasting and friendly relationships between the food chain industry and the agricultural community and lessening the clamor for Government interference.

The Slovak Educational Society of Beccaria, Pa., Celebrates Its 51st Anniversary by Completing a Fine Recreational Project of Great Value to the Children of the Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 1, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, nestling in the mountains of central Pennsylvania is the community of Beccaria, situated in Clearfield County and having a population of less than 600. Despite the size of the community, it has set an example of civic cooperation through the activities of the Slovak Educational Society which has rendered outstanding service during the 51 years of its existence.

In addition to the many programs launched by the Slovak Educational Society the most recent one has attracted widespread attention since it concerns the recreational needs for over 200 of the community's children. The great success of the various programs is indicative of what can be accomplished by an organization of 235 members who have the determination to make their community a better place in which to live.

The following interesting article titled, "Fine Playground Is Latest Project of Beccaria Lodge" was written by Jane F. Smith, staff writer for the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress and appeared in the August 30, 1961, edition. The article pays a deserving tribute to the officers and members of the Slovak Educational Society of Beccaria and is a fitting salute to that organization in celebrating its 51st anniversary:

FINE PLAYGROUND IS LATEST PROJECT OF BECCARIA LODGE

(By Jane F. Smith)

BECCARIA.—Celebrating its 51st anniversary this year, the Slovak Educational Society of Beccaria points with pride to its latest community project—a modern supervised playground for youngsters of the area.

The Slovak Educational Society of Beccaria was organized in 1910, for the "purpose of educating and promoting noncitizens to be-

come good citizens of these United States of America." During the past 20 years, in addition to meeting those objectives, it has educated and promoted good fellowship and citizenship of the entire membership, which is presently 235 strong.

Among its milestones are its playground and building programs and its active participation in various community fund drives on the National, State, and local levels.

Recognizing the recreational needs for 200 youngsters of the Beccaria vicinity's population of 550, this organization went in action in 1958 to establish a playground across the street from its clubhouse in Beccaria.

After 3 years of landscaping and development, the supervised playground today is as modern as in any large town. The equipment includes a combination unit with sliding board, seesaws, and swings. It can boast a merry-go-round with enclosure safety platform; an American safety giant stride unit with six giant stride ladders and an American nursery three-swing set for the tiny tots.

Future plans call for the purchase of additional land adjoining the present playground and for a ball diamond for adult and little league baseball. Interest is keen in this sport, already evidenced by the young boys' softball team comprised of Michael Dobish, Thomas Plestrack, Michael Yelko, Daniel Dobish, James Washell, David Dobish, Norman Dobish, John Bungo, Alan Fundack, Donald Kitko, Arthur Yelko, Dennis McCoy, and M. Joseph Gero.

Tennis courts and a swimming pool are also on the agenda in the playground planning program.

Now many of the Beccaria swimmers are making use of the Smithhill swimming pool. This the society assisted with physical and financial support during its construction several years ago, along with its various fund campaigns.

Officials of the Beccaria Slovak Educational Society lauded the boys and girls of Beccaria for their respect for the playground equipment and their expressions of gratitude to the organization for the benefits derived from the community activities provided by this adult group. Because of the youths' appreciative attitude, the society has taken initial steps to sponsor Boy and Girl Scout units at Beccaria.

A spokesman stated, "These youngsters are our citizens of tomorrow. We aim to provide the very best opportunities for our boys and girls today, so that in the future they, as adult community leaders, will be even more prepared to continue the community betterment program that is presently evident in Beccaria. We feel that boy and girl scouting will assist the youth to become good citizens, along with the other opportunities they have in their school, church, and community activities."

Located in the heart of Beccaria, the one-story frame brick-shingled clubhouse of the Beccaria Slovak Educational Society was built by members in 1940. Attractive both inside and out, the building was constructed under a very unique financial plan of action.

Usable material from a building purchased for \$250 from the Berwin White Coal Co. at 29 Shaft, near Beccaria, was used for the clubhouse construction. This building program was under the guidance of John Mondy, who was head boss, carpenter, stonemason, and plumber, as related to the writer by an official of the society.

Every member who contributed time toward the construction was paid 25 cents an hour. The amount of time worked was accurately recorded by a timekeeper.

Under completion of the building in about 3 or 4 years, the organization received its club license. This meant the society was in business. It also meant that with an income the organization could meet its obligations by paying off the promissory notes at 6 percent interest to the members who loaned money for construction expenditures; also it meant that all members who put in long hours on the building construction would now receive wages at the rate of 25 cents for every hour they worked.

The members can be well proud of their clubhouse with its 50- by 40-foot social room; a 42- by 20-foot grill room, and its 10- by 20-foot kitchen. It also has a large basement and storage space. Steam heated and air conditioned, the clubhouse is modern in every detail. The rooms are fully equipped for banquets and other social events.

Interested in all community betterment projects, the society annually supports the numerous fund drives, starting in January with the "March of Dimes" and on down the line of monthly fund campaigns.

It is an ardent supporter of the B-C-I Joint High School band and its B-C-I Band Boosters Association. It annually plays host at a luncheon at the clubhouse to the band on Memorial Day.

It was the first contributor of funds toward the erection of a new church for the Beccaria Christian and Missionary Alliance, which lost its building by fire several years ago.

It has also given its financial support to the recently innovated B-C-I Quarterback Club in its sponsorship of football at B-C-I.

The Slovak Educational Society of Beccaria is taking steps for a big celebration in commemoration of its 51st anniversary, which calls for a September open house at its clubhouse. Four charter members will be honored guests. They are John Scollins, Andrew Popyack, Sr., John Kollar, and John Kovalsky.

The Slovak Educational Society of Beccaria is presently under the leadership of an executive board composed of Andrew E. Popyack, president; John Bungo, vice president; Joseph T. Washell, secretary; John Temchack, treasurer; John Bartek, financial secretary; John Plestrack, Joseph Gero, and Michael Dobish, all trustees.

It's Finally Up to the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion of the importance of man in our modern defense concept. The Congress has expressed its unwillingness to rely on missiles and push-button warfare alone. I believe the following editorial from the Junction City (Kans.) Daily Union is most pertinent and will be of interest to Members of the House:

IT'S FINALLY UP TO THE MAN

It would be difficult to find a more forthright and outspoken individual than Gen. Curtis LeMay. Also it goes without saying it would be almost impossible to find a more hard-bitten advocate of manned aircraft than the former head of the Strategic Air Command.

With these thoughts in mind, it is interesting to read his remarks before the national convention of Jewish War Veterans in Baltimore. "Missiles will never replace man," General LeMay said, "You can use a missile only in war. Before you push the button you are at peace. The moment you

push it you are at war. With a manned system you can do many things. You can launch a manned weapon if you suspect an enemy attack is imminent, then recall it if the alert proves false. Manned aircraft and missiles complement each other, one does not replace the other."

And we feel that had General LeMay been pressed, he would have admitted that after all is said and done the ultimate weapon is the foot soldier, just as it was at the Marne, Belleau Wood, Guadalcanal, Okinawa, Omaha Beach, the Hurtgen Forest and the Rhine River.

Soviet Nuclear Policies Threaten Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the resumption of nuclear testing by the Soviet Union represents a serious threat to peace and a new danger to our security and a hazard for human life.

Reflecting "about-face" changes in Soviet policy, I would like to quote remarks from Mr. Khrushchev's earlier statements regarding nuclear testing:

First. Speech at the U.N. General Assembly, September 23, 1960:

We shall do everything in our power to make general and complete disarmament a reality, to rid humanity of the arms race and the threat of a new war of annihilation.

Second. February 15, 1958:

The Soviet Government stands firmly for the complete and unconditional cessation of atomic and nuclear-weapons tests. Three years ago the Soviet Union was the first of the great powers to propose an agreement to end these tests and in that way take the first step toward the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons and their elimination from national armament.

Third. On January 14, 1960, he said:

Should any side violate the obligations [to refrain from testing] to which it has committed itself, the instigators of such violations will cover themselves with shame, and they will be condemned by the peoples of the world.

With characteristic "doubletalk", the Soviet Union is now attempting to justify its change in nuclear policy and to blame the United States for its action.

On Sunday, September 3, I was privileged to discuss major aspects of this new situation in a broadcast over Radio Station WGN, Chicago. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY URGES WESTERN ANTIDOTE TO NUCLEAR TESTS BY COMMUNISTS

This week Soviet Premier Khrushchev, once again, undercut the world's hopes for progress toward peace. How? By declaring that the Soviet Union will resume testing of nuclear bombs. In my judgment, the resumption of such tests could be a dangerous step toward man's destruction.

Provocatively it represents—

A threat to the security of the United States—which has suspended nuclear testing since 1958;

A heightening of world tensions; A serious hazard—that could have not only immediate, but long-range effects—to the health of the nearly 3 billion people of earth, by further saturation of the air we breath with radioactive fallout.

The resumption of testing, too, will result in higher costs of armaments for both East and West.

Moreover, it may hasten the day when Red China—a grave threat to peace in the Far East—will possess nuclear bombs to support its aggressive policies.

By experience, we know that such major changes in strategy do not happen accidentally in Red policy.

Around the globe, then, the question is being asked: Why should Khrushchev choose this time to resume testing of nuclear bombs? The range of answers includes the following:

1. He wants an opportunity to test and show off the 100-megaton superbomb—about which he has been bragging.

2. Unsatisfied with present tactics, attempts at nuclear blackmail, again will become a major aspect of Communist policy. Specifically, this includes, as we have witnessed, threats of annihilation against countries cooperating with the West for common defense—particularly those in NATO.

3. A further heightening of world tensions—including raising the specter of nuclear war—may be necessary to keep the dominated people mobilized against the West.

Following the ominous, provocation declaration, Mr. Khrushchev is now busy trying to justify the decision. Around the globe, the Red-propaganda machine is cranking out lame excuses—including in engaging in double talk aimed at blaming the United States for the Red decision to resume testing.

In the face of such false charges, however, the United States must be alert to speak up in self-defense.

The peaceshaking provocation, too, is making its own dramatic impact upon world thinking. Reactions of nations have been crystallized in such terms as: "dangerous action;" "bad news;" "setbacks to progress toward reduction of armaments;" "a fateful decision that seriously threatens world peace."

In the face of this new aggressive tactic by the Soviet Union, then what can be done? First, and foremost, I believe that—

1. The nations attending the Conference in Belgrade should demonstrate their mettle by speaking out against resumption of nuclear testing:

2. The U.N., opening September 19, should take vigorous action to discourage further nuclear tests, as well as to establish a system of arms reduction and control—including test bans.

Overall, the prevention of nuclear war is a matter of great concern, not just to the opposing East-West nations, but to all the countries of the world.

Despite the magnitude of the dangers, let me stress this: This is no time for hysteria, paralysis by fear, or adopting of an attitude of peace at any price by nations. Rather, we—confident in the rightness of our cause—must fearlessly take steps to meet the challenges, including the following:

A solemn evaluation of the danger; Further strengthening Western deterrent power—including taking the necessary steps to protect ourselves with a nuclear antidote;

Exertion of a greater effort for halting the arms race; and

A mobilization of world opinion against Red tactics, which threaten to endanger the lives of all people—either by war, or by oversaturating the atmosphere with radioactive fallout.

Letter From a Private, First Class, in Germany to His Family Back Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter which was handed to me by Gen. Bruce Clarke, who commands our troops in Europe. It is a letter of a private, first class, in the U.S. Army written to his family back home. This is a down-to-earth but thrilling account of the reaction of an American boy to the reception given to his unit on their way through East Germany and after their arrival in West Berlin. This letter should tell all of us a great deal that we need to know:

COMPANY,

1ST BATTLE GROUP, 18TH INFANTRY,

APO 28, New York, N.Y.

DEAR FOLKS: I suppose that by now you have read about the sharp strike outfit of the 1st Battle Group, 18th Infantry moving into Berlin. I think I can truthfully say that this is the most exciting thing I have ever participated in in all my life. Man, we were ready to fight our way across the Helmstedt Gate. They woke us up at midnight of the 19th on an alert. Six hours later we had everything loaded on the trucks and we were on the road. Half of the men didn't get breakfast, but I managed to get six eggs. Good thing I did, too, for we kept on driving right through lunch. That night at the border we got nothing but soup and coffee. We pitched our tents at midnight and broke them at 0015 and loaded everything back up. Sitting up in the 2½'s was not much fun while waiting for the daylight to come, but thinking about the ammo that was being passed out to the line companies in case we had to shoot our way into Berlin kept us awake. Well, we left at about 0500 and ate cold C rations (by then they tasted pretty good) on the road. The next time we stopped was when we pulled into this kaserne in Berlin. I am telling you that I have never in history seen anything like the way the people of this city greeted us as we drove in. They lined up by the thousands from the gate all the way to this kaserne. And we drove up and down all the main streets of this monstrous city as a show of strength and a demonstration that the Americans are going to defend these people all the way. I broke out my camera and took 34 pictures of the entire episode in this city. We had what just about amounted to a guided tour. The people were so happy to see us that some of them were literally crying. Placards, banners, posters, everything greeted us as though we had just returned from a victorious war. I felt just like General Eisenhower on his victory parade in New York City after World War II. About a third of the way down the parade we passed Colonel Johns (our CO) standing on a platform next to LYNDON JOHNSON watching the men pass by. You better believe I took pictures of that. When Mr. JOHNSON saw me pass by standing up taking a picture of them he looked at me and waved. Big thrill, but not as much as the one from the realization that I am really in the thick of it all defending my country and freedom and democracy the world over in the world's hottest spot. The whole trip yesterday was an experience to top everything else I have ever done. Driving right through the Communist troops—and they had units on both sides of us and men stationed along the

road every few hundred meters—was really something. What a change of air there was as soon as we got into East Germany. The people were very glad to see us going through to Berlin, and every time we passed a group they would wave if there were no Communist soldiers watching. I could go on and on about all this, but I am sure that this is a familiar story to you all, particularly Dad.

Mobilization for Religious and Welfare Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in view of the deepening crisis over Berlin, it is imperative for the entire Nation to plan and consider what action must be taken to meet this crisis.

The National Jewish Welfare Board is already moving to meet additional demands of Jewish religious and welfare services for military personnel and their dependents, as a result of the emergency buildup in Armed Forces strength. I am glad to observe the immediate and patriotic response of this association to meet the new personal as well as military demands for our people and to make firm and lasting the ties between the individual, his home, and his religion.

I ask unanimous consent to include a press release from the National Jewish Welfare Board in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD REPORTS TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY ON REMOBILIZATION FOR RELIGIOUS AND WELFARE SERVICES TO JEWISH GI'S SUNDAY, AUGUST 6, 1961

NEW YORK.—The National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) today reported to President John F. Kennedy that it is remobilizing all its resources and manpower to meet additional demands for religious and welfare services to Jewish military personnel and their dependents resulting from the emergency buildup of Armed Forces strength requested by the President and approved by Congress.

In a letter to President Kennedy, Solomon Litt, New York, president of JWB, declared that "on behalf of American Jewry, which the National Jewish Welfare Board has represented since World War I in serving their religious, welfare, and morale needs of Jewish military personnel and their dependents, it is my privilege to report to you that we are remobilizing all our resources and manpower to meet whatever needs may arise in the light of your call for a buildup of military strength."

JWB is the Government-authorized agency for meeting the religious and morale needs of Jewish military personnel and of Jewish patients in Veterans Administration hospitals, and represents the Jewish community in the United Service Organizations (USO). JWB is also the national association of Jewish Community Centers and YM-YWHA's.

In his letter to President Kennedy, Mr. Litt cited four steps JWB has already taken: "Our Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy and its associated rabbinical bodies are mov-

ing swiftly to assure that there is adequate chaplaincy coverage at every military installation at home and abroad.

"Our armed services division is alerting its 260 local committees and their thousands of volunteers to be ready to provide whatever additional morale and welfare services may be needed.

"We are reviewing our logistical support of religious supplies, literature and services over and above that provided by the Government with a view to meeting all the religious and morale needs of men in the Armed Forces.

"We are also calling upon our more than 300 affiliated Jewish Community Centers and YM-YWHA's to be ready to lend their know-how and facilities for any expanded morale and recreational services to the military that become necessary."

Mr. LITT wrote the President that his address of July 25, "alerting all Americans to the critical world situation that requires a major enlargement of our military forces, has placed upon all of us the responsibility to do whatever may be in our power, individually and collectively, to answer your call. May God give our country the vision and courage to continue, under your leadership, unhindered and unafraid to pursue the path of decency and righteousness which we have always trod and which you have recharted for us."

We Must Act in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, a page 1, Los Angeles Times editorial August 10, 1961, calls for some strong action by the United States in Cuba.

The basic theme is still timely. How are we to show firmness in Berlin if we allow this Communist sore to fester only 90 miles from Florida? I submit the editorial for the attention of all Americans.

WE MUST ACT IN CUBA

Communist Cuba is a modern Caribbean pirate nest. Its rulers encourage by example all the Communist conspirators, criminals and crackpots of the islands and the adjacent continent. They have shown they can threaten American lives and property, and injure the prestige of the U.S. Government at a critical time in international affairs.

So the United States has got to destroy this pirate nest.

The fact that the Cuban Government released the last hijacked American plane and its crew and passengers does not alter the necessity of action by the U.S. Government. As long as Castro operates as an outlaw he will inspire outlawry throughout the hemisphere.

The case against the Castro government is plain. What is less apparent is that unless the United States acts at once against Castro, and acts boldly this country will be isolated from most of Latin America in short order—sooner than Moscow's time schedule calls for the event.

We have made war for less injury than Castro has done us and for less threat to our legitimate interests in this hemisphere.

The United States can't wait hopefully for an internal revolution in Cuba. Massive Soviet aid to Castro has made that impossible without external help.

The United States ought to move now and move with all necessary military strength.

Study of Nation's Transport Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, our Nation's transportation system is in vital need of a major revamping. This is most important not only from the standpoint of national defense, but for economic strength and stability as well as continuation of our free enterprise system. For these reasons and others, I recommend that my colleagues read the following story from the August 15 issue of the Daily Bond Buyer reporting on President Kennedy's assignment to Secretary of Commerce Hodges to study all phases of transportation and make recommendations to him by December of this year.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMERCE SECRETARY HODGES READY TO TACKLE STUDY OF NATION'S TRANSPORT PROBLEMS

(By John Gerrity)

WASHINGTON, August 18.—There was a wistful quality in Luther Hodges' voice as he spoke to reporters last week about the Nation's transportation problems. "It's probably the toughest assignment I'll be asked to take, so long as I'm in this job," the Commerce Secretary said. "And, by the way, if any of you have any suggestions on how we can lick this thing, I'll certainly welcome them."

Suggestions are one thing Secretary Hodges doesn't need. For the past 20 years, at least; his Department has been surfeited with suggestions, as he and his new aid, Dr. Gayton E. Germane, will soon discover, when they take up the monolithic task President Kennedy has handed them: To analyze the Nation's transportation system; evaluate it in terms of our needs for the next decade; summarize the entire problem in one concise memorandum; add a draft omnibus bill that will satisfy the railroads, airlines, truckers, coastal ship operators, barge owners, shippers, freight handlers, users and passengers, unions and management, State and local governments, and the public—and deliver the completed package to the President's desk by December 1.

Huge as this task may be, Mr. Hodges and his staff aren't getting started a moment too soon. Indeed, drastic action next year may be too late to prevent the nationalization of railroads within the next 10 or 15 years, a substantial reduction in the number of airlines and the tight regulation of what would become an essentially noncompetitive system.

CRITICS PICTURE

Critics of this and previous administrations who are genuinely fearful nothing short of a miracle can bring some kind of order out of the present day chaos, insist that consistent procrastination—interrupted only by suggestions and studies—has produced this picture:

Railroads today are earning 1.45 percent on their investment. Carloadings are 13 percent under a year ago. Expenditures for new equipment and rolling stock is off by a third.

Airlines lost almost \$20 million in the first 5 months of 1961, and made only \$2 million last year, despite total revenues of nearly \$2 billion. Because of the high costs of jets, ferocious competition for business on the lucrative routes and flights that have been running 40 percent empty, airlines will be most fortunate if their total losses this year aren't double their slight combined profit last year.

Intercity buses are carrying only 18 or 19 passengers on an average trip, the same number as they carried 10 years ago, while the capacity of the larger buses now in service is 39 passengers, as opposed to 35 in the 1950's.

Trucks and barges that do not now come under effective Federal regulation haul one-third of the intercity freight, compared with 21 percent in 1946. Nonregulated carriers are expected to carry 61 percent of the business 10 years from now.

These are but a few of the hallmarks of universal gloom. There are more. A Senate staff study estimated earlier this year that at least \$50 billion will be needed in the next decade to keep the transportation industry abreast of the expected needs. Yet, said the report, prepared by Retired Gen. John P. Doyle for the Senate Commerce Committee, the industry can be expected to generate only 10 to 20 percent—or \$5 to \$10 billion—of the \$50 billion needed for investment purposes.

Massive Government aid which means stepped-up subsidies, nationalization or carefully regulated competition—or very possibly all three—and not merely tax relief or relaxed ratemaking rules will be needed. Much of this helps to explain the administration's reluctance to plunge into the transportation crisis until now, and its preference to put off decisions in the name of additional study. It also explains what Mr. Hodges and his experts will have to hump, if they expect to salvage anything even distantly akin to what has often been euphemistically referred to as "a free competitive transportation system."

WHO'S TO BLAME?

Doubtless, the Government itself, and its hodgepodge mess of regulatory bodies, must share prominently in the blame. James M. Landis, the President's adviser on regulatory agencies as well as on transportation problems, has opposed suggestions that a Department of Transportation be established to coordinate Federal transportation policies and regulations. Rather, Mr. Landis argued for a White House coordinator to see that agencies concerned with some aspect of the problem were not working at cross purposes.

The recent Senate study, a massive 732-page affair, however, as well as President Eisenhower's administration, were solidly behind the idea of a Transportation Department. The President's recent decision to give the job back to Secretary Hodges, for the time being, at least, impliedly tendered Mr. Landis his comeuppance, and it augurs well for the creation of an independent department, since Mr. Hodges is known to lean in that direction.

Except for the functions of the Federal Aviation Agency, most transportation administration functions are centered in the Commerce Department. Regulatory activities are parceled out to such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Maritime Administration.

The FAA's Najeef Halaby, by far the administration's most able appointee in the transportation field, frankly admits that he is concerned solely with promoting aviation, even though such activities may be to the detriment of the railroads or buses on short-haul routes that could be just as well, or better, served by surface transportation.

The ICC, where the chairmanship still rotates and cannot be controlled by the administration, is intolerant of any intervention into affairs it considers its own domain. Thus when Mr. Lanids and Myer Feldman, another White House aide, worked long hours and days trying to shore up the New Haven Railroad, which recently went into receivership, the ICC chose to ignore their efforts. Similarly, the proposal to combine the Baltimore & Ohio and the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroads was kicked around from expert to expert until it arrived finally at the ICC, where, if past performances are any criteria, it will remain for months, if not years.

After years of trying to elevate the Maritime Administration to a stature loftier than that of a mere counter of vessels, President Kennedy ordered into force last Sunday a reorganization plan that the Senate had reluctantly approved, because "anything would be better than what we have now." Primary changes in the reorganization plan will serve to expand its regulatory powers to a degree not yet determined and to give the Maritime Administration direct jurisdiction over ship-building subsidy programs.

All of these internequine quarrels and jealousies do little except complicate still further Mr. Hodges' problems. He may not be surprised, but he should be shocked, when he learns that the FAA and the CAB do not talk to each other, literally. (A bond buyer reporter covering a story in the FAA, was given the information he sought only on his solemn pledge not to tell anyone in the CAB where he got the information or what he was writing.) The ICC refuses to recognize the existence of the Maritime Administration, as was demonstrated not long ago when the ICC refused to let Maritime read its preliminary reports in a piggyback case involving the rails and ships.

TRAGIC NONPERFORMANCE

Ludicrous as some of the instances may be, the overall pattern is one of tragic nonperformance. A classic example of the lack of cooperation in an area crying for correction is the expansion of air traffic and the decline of railroads over such short routes as Washington to New York or New York to Boston. Here are routes where railroads or even bus transportation could be as convenient as air travel from the crowded skies over Washington and Boston to the even more congested New York approach patterns.

Still another smirch on the escutcheon of transportation is the disappointing record of the \$41 billion highway program which has moved slowly despite its political popularity and the persuasive lobbying activities of the automotive and trucking interests. Shortly after the President freed an additional \$650 million to help speed the program the Bureau of Public Roads proudly released its quarterly report on progress. It states that 10,800 miles of the 41,000 national system are now open to traffic. But it makes no mention of the fact that the program scheduled to be completed in 1972 won't be finished until after 1975. Nor is any mention made of the untold interstate squabbles, or the 10 or more still unsettled cases of graft and fraud, that have combined to slow down

work on a major system, large portions of which will be obsolete, when the total project is presumed to be finished.

ALLIGATOR TEARS FOR HODGES

Transportation experts readily acknowledge the enormity of these billion dollar problems, and their sympathy for Mr. Hodges and his aids is profound. Yet many of these same experts, in and out of the Government, are themselves much to blame for they cannot divorce themselves from the vested interests they hold. Unions and many sectors of management are equally guilty, and many, in fact, want no tampering with the transportation system whatever. They prefer things as they are.

Consequently, when Mr. Hodges contemplates facets of his toughest assignment, and gropes for suggestions on how to do the job, there can be, in the end, only one suggestion. Do it.

Sure, Talk Colonialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in yesterday's New York Daily News presented a thoughtful analysis of the problems of colonialism, past and present. I agree with the analysis and recommendations there stated and I am glad to be able to place the editorial in the record. I hope it will be widely read and supported:

SURE, TALK COLONIALISM

Rather than shoot a conventional Labor Day editorial today, we'll wish our friends in organized labor prosperity and discretion, and proceed to discuss Soviet Russia's request that colonialism be put on the agenda of the upcoming 16th session of the United Nations General Assembly.

This request by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko is of importance to U.S. organized labor, as is any Soviet maneuver—because if communism ever takes over the world there will be no more labor unions as we know them.

What Gromyko wants discussed is colonialism as long practiced and now being largely abandoned by Britain and France.

What U.S. U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson should insist on also discussing is colonialism as currently practiced by Soviet Russia and Red China.

Russia has long held—in cruel bondage a huge fistful of once independent nations: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, East Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and the Ukraine.

Red China up to now holds only North Korea and Tibet in slavery, but hopes to expand its colonial empire.

TYRANNICAL RED EMPIRE

Both Russia and Red China are far more cruel to their colonies than the British, French, Germans, Dutch, and Portuguese ever were.

By all means let's insist that Soviet colonialism go on the General Assembly agenda for an exhaustive discussion.

Continued and vigorous agitation of the captive nations' question is one of the best propaganda weapons we have against the Red slave empire—as a means of keeping its rulers off balance and, conceivably, of some day causing that empire to explode from within.

There is a grave question though, in many people's minds as to whether the Kennedy administration intends to use the captive nations weapon in the cold war, or even to keep it.

In his July 25 speech on the Berlin crisis, the President said, among other things:

"We recognize the Soviet Union's historical concerns about their security in central and eastern Europe, after a series of ravaging invasions—and we believe arrangements can be worked out which will help to meet these concerns, and make it possible for both security and freedom to exist in this troubled area."

To a lot of us, that sounds like a cautiously worded offer to Khrushchev to forget all about our concern for the liberation of the captive nations, in return for a promise by him to let West Berlin continue free, capitalistic, and unhampered as to its routes of communication with West Germany.

Khrushchev would be happy to make such a promise at such a price.

But he would break the promise the moment he felt he could get away with doing so; and the price itself is too great for us to pay.

By paying it, we would officially admit Khrushchev's right to keep the captive nations in chains forever, give those peoples over to despair for themselves and hatred of us, and junk one of the best cold-war weapons now in the Western arsenal.

TALK TO KENNEDY IN HIS LANGUAGE

How to blast out of the President's mind any thoughts he may be having along these lines?

We'd suggest that the Assembly of Captive European Nations and all other Iron and Bamboo Curtain refugee groups in this country get busy, and get busy now.

Their objective should be, it seems to us, to convince President Kennedy that, if he sells the captive nations or any part of them down the river, he and his party can count on losing large blocks of Polish, Hungarian, German, etc., etc., votes permanently to the Republicans.

The Republicans can contribute their bit by stepping up their own longstanding insistence that the captive nations never be written off by the American people.

Just as Khrushchev best understands brute strength, so Kennedy best understands the language of practical race group politics. The abovementioned groups had better start putting the pressure on him before it is too late.

Role of Labor in 1960's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday our Nation observed Labor Day. The observance not only offered an opportunity to pay tribute to the indispensable role of labor to our security and progress, but also to reassess the role of labor in the ever-greater challenges of the future.

Privileged to review these and other aspects of the labor picture in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of my remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY SEES LABOR AS VOICE OF FREEDOM
Labor Day, September 4, offers an opportunity to:

Pay tribute to the 73.6 million men and women in our labor force—including more than 1.6 million in Wisconsin; and

Create a greater understanding, and respect for, the unique, indispensable contribution of our workers to the Nation's progress.

Today, the Nation is experiencing a high rate of employment—estimated at more than 68 million. Regrettably, however, there are still far too many unemployed—more than 5 million, or about 7 percent of the labor force. This includes approximately 70,000 in Wisconsin.

In Labor Day observations, then, we—in addition to paying recognition to the role of labor in our economy—must also face the challenges of—

Finding new jobs for the unemployed;

Creating more effective machinery to minimize the up-and-down economic cycles—particularly the down—that too often result in our rate of unemployment;

Promote peace in the labor field; and

Generally find ways to further improve the economic status of the workers—although now at the highest level in the history of the world.

Within our free system, workers in the vineyard of our national life—and that includes all of us, one way or another—enjoy all too often taken for granted opportunities and privileges, as well as responsibility. These include—

The right of selecting one's own vocation—not having it dictated by the State;

The right to bargain for a just share of the fruits of labor;

The opportunity to advance—according to one's ability and the worth of his contribution to progress;

The choice even of changing jobs—in the midstream of life—if this best serves our personal needs;

The opportunity—occurring to an ever larger degree—of having a voice in both management and national economic policies.

ROLE OF UNIONS

Historically the voice of working men and women has not always been proportionate to their contributions to progress. Advancement by the trade union movement, however, has changed this picture.

Throughout the United States union membership has increased from 3 million in 1953 to more than 17 million. As a result, today the worker through his union represents a great and growing force in American life.

Traditionally, workers and their unions have, for example, concentrated their efforts toward attaining a fair share of the rewards of production efforts, including better wages, greater job security, improved working conditions, retirement, and other benefits.

With a powerful collective voice, the worker is now also "speaking up" and helping to design policies for economic progress, as well as national security. With such power, of course, goes, hand-in-hand, a greater responsibility, not only for serving the labor force, but the welfare of the country.

Naturally, labor has its special interests—as does management, the consumer, and others. The challenge, however, is to attain—and exercise—the maturity and perspective which will allow each interest to pursue its special purposes. At the same time, we must not lose sight of the impact which such actions—particularly if powerful and far-reaching—can have upon the overall interests of the Nation and its people.

Fortunately, the labor movement in America, with some exceptions, has benefited from sound, responsible leadership. Partic-

ularly in Wisconsin, we have reaped the rewards of good, levelheaded, hard-working forward-looking leaders.

In the world of tomorrow, our Nation will demand, and require, an even greater sense of public responsibility from the leaders and rank-and-file members of labor, management, and all walks of life. The purpose: To assure our Nation the capability to meet the challenges of its security and fulfill the needs of its people.

Without this creative, farsighted, dedicated sense of civic and national responsibility, we may not survive. With it, we, as a Nation, shall—I am confident—win victory over communism and create an ever-better life for our people—and, yes, mankind around the globe.

RESPONSIBILITY GOES HAND IN HAND WITH POWER

Within our free system, we must then carefully and vigilantly protect, preserve and perpetuate the rights of workers to speak—to organize—to bargain.

In such bargaining—a process fundamental to labor-management cooperation and economic progress in our system—however, there is also a larger responsibility for—

Consideration of the effect of wage-price boosts on consumer buying and living costs;

Evaluation of the effect of higher production costs on ability of U.S. products to compete on the domestic and world markets;

Keeping abreast of the impact of technology and automation on production and employment, and devising ways to cope with such problems;

Assuring that labor benefits result from proportionately greater productivity;

And other broad scope considerations—which, if neglected, may, in the long run, adversely affect our future.

In our closely integrated economy, no great segment—labor, industry, professional groups, or others—can adopt a wholly self-serving attitude—ignoring the public interest.

We recall, of course, regrettable circumstances in which it has been necessary to take disciplinary action for a minority. However, this should not, and must not reflect unfairly on the vast majority of able, competent leaders and members of any labor force. Rather, the aim must be to provide a climate in which abuses can be curbed; but, at the same time, the rights and legitimate aims of workers and unions can be fully protected.

Today, we are engaged in a great global battle. The struggle will determine whether freedom or communism rules the world.

Around the globe there is a strong, common bond among workers of all nations. As powerful forces, unions have ever-greater opportunity and responsibility to serve as voices of peace, progress, and freedom. As dynamic transmitters of the ideas and ideals of freedom, U.S. labor can demonstrate—

How free trade unionism best serves a working people;

How free collective bargaining can create a workers-share-in-the-rewards kind of economy—not a trickle-down benefit system from either a cartel-like business system or a state-controlled dictatorship;

How under freedom the worker enjoys respect for his rights and integrity, including the maximum degree of freedom allowable within an organized society; and finally,

How participation in Government, of, by, and from the people, has created the best standards of living in the history of the world and promises ever-better living for the future.

If freedom is to survive, we must more effectively mobilize our people and resources. The working men and women of America, I believe, can be a real strategic force in the fight against the Red global conspiracy.

CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE

Now, what about the future?

Generally, it would appear that the American worker can look forward to real—not just promissory—improvements in his economic life. Among other things, this may well include—

A further refinement, and, as warranted, improvement of wage scales to reflect value and expansion of productivity;

Liberalization of retirement benefits;

Greater job security; and

Ever-better working conditions.

In times of peace, also, our workers could probably look forward to a shorter workweek. In these critical days, however, the Nation may well require greater—not lesser—effort to meet the threats to our security.

Of great significance, also, is the need to encourage maximum exercise of the ingenuity, creativity, and enterprising spirit—by free Americans working in a free climate. Upon this foundation, we, as a people—and our forefathers—have created the greatest nation in the history of the world. Upon this resource, too, we will depend for the new ideas to meet the complex, difficult challenges ahead.

On the responsibility side, the public, I believe, has the right to expect of our workers—particularly in times of crisis—extra dedication, devotion, and willingness to work and sweat to create the tools of progress and security. In the past, this record has been outstanding. I am confident this will be true for the future.

Hanford Project—Statesmen's Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the controversial public/private power issue has plagued Congress for decades.

Irrespective of merits on either side, the heated controversy it generates inescapably scorchers whatever it contacts.

This has become the case with the Nation's nuclear science program—because of the Hanford project dispute.

It is immaterial whether the public/private power issue logically belongs in the Hanford dispute—either in its original \$95 million 800,000 kilowatt form or its current \$58 million 400,000 kilowatt conference report form.

It has, in fact, become involved and its adverse affects are apparent to the extent some legislators are talking of a "bare-bone" Atomic Energy authorization bill unless the House agrees to the conference report.

This would mean many research projects necessary to maintain our country's lead in nuclear science would be stripped out at this critical time in world history.

Yet, in the end, accepting the conference report would not bring a better result.

Accepting it would establish atomic energy authorization bills as a legitimate battleground of the public/private power controversy. Next year, the following year and in the years beyond this con-

troverly repeatedly would plague the Nation's nuclear science efforts.

These annual controversies would accumulate delays in our nuclear science program in the aggregate as stifling as those involved in a "bare-bone" bill this year.

There is a way to avoid this dilemma. It is by keeping power projects such as Hanford out of atomic energy bills entirely. Fighting them out on some less critical battleground. This can be done simply, but it will require a high order of statesmanship.

It amounts to adopting and adhering to a policy of placing nuclear-electric facilities, other than experimental, prototype, and demonstration facilities, in the public works authorization bill rather than the atomic energy authorization bill.

Thereby the public/private power issue will not be permitted to impede our nuclear science programs.

Nor, in the public works bill as independent items of appropriation to power administrations such as TVA and BPA, should the controversy unduly impede progress with other, nonrelated public works items.

Two Unforgettable Characters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article from the Blue Anchor published by the California Fruit Exchange.

The article is a deserving tribute to Fred and Mary Motz who now reside in Mathews, Va.

For 41 years "Doc" Motz served ably in several types of public service. Let me emphasize the word "service" for that was Fred's guiding dedication.

Perhaps more than any other, Fred Motz was responsible for the rebirth and revitalization of our Foreign Agricultural Service in 1954. He had been one of the first to join this Service at its inception in the late 1920's. He had seen this Service become "Foreign Agriculture Relations." This did not please Fred Motz for he wanted a vital "service" capable of serving American agriculture day by day.

I am happy that I was one of those Members of Congress to whom he explained just what the Service should be and what it could do. This finally resulted in its reorganization in 1954. The record since has been good.

Both Mrs. Horan and I have experienced the warm and gracious hospitality of Fred and Mary Motz. Both of us are happy that Al Smith and Fred Read have made this article possible:

TWO UNFORGETTABLE CHARACTERS

(By Fred W. Read, general manager, California Fruit Exchange)

(AUTHOR'S COMMENT.—The introduction to this article has been written by J. A. Smith, president of Gwin, White & Prine, Inc., of Seattle, Wash., one of the largest exporters of boxed apples in the United States and intimately acquainted by reason of long years in Europe, with conditions in that part of the world. "Al" Smith, as he is known, has been and continues to be a long-time friend of "Doc" Motz. His comments are particularly timely.)

A PERSONAL NOTE ABOUT "DOC" MOTZ AND MARY

"Fred Read has written a story about a truly successful couple—Fred 'Doc' and Mary Motz. Old friends never think of them separately but, in a fruit publication, the emphasis is appropriately on 'Doc.'"

"I met him in London just over 30 years ago, shortly after he had been appointed the U.S. Department of Agriculture's European Fruit Specialist, with headquarters in the American Embassy. His assignment was commercial—to assist U.S. producers to market their fruit in Europe. His efforts were remarkably successful. But, notably, 'Doc' was then, in the 1930's initiating a unique type of personal diplomacy which was to prove as effective as any our Government has ever provided in any area of diplomatic activity known to me. Would that more of our political diplomats had his depth of understanding, resourcefulness, analytical ability, technical know-how, dedication to the jobs at hand and personal magnetism."

"'Doc,' in Europe over 25 years, was everlastingly an American, abounding with unchanging American characteristics and creating an atmosphere of mutual respect with the Europeans he contacted. In the language of the Foreign Service, he never went native, and Europeans liked him all the more for it."

"'Doc's' renowned humor is expressed in anecdotes and runs the gamut from Chaucer to Joe Miller, his dialect something that surely must have had its roots in Oregon, was polished a bit in Virginia, but somehow seems to take its sustenance from the Carolina hills. His experience, as broad as his interminable travels, includes the intricacies of the worldwide fruit production and marketing, to preserving the magnificent Austrian strain of horses, the Lipizzaners, while doing food administrative work following Austria's liberation in World War II."

"It all added up to a remarkable diplomatic career during which the U.S. fruit industry had numberless occasions to thank its lucky stars that he was the industry's man, and today, several years after his retirement, no fruitman travels from the United States to visit his European customers without benefitting from the trading foundations 'Doc' built."

"To me, above, all, the secret of success lies in 'Doc's' and Mary's capacity for friendship. There are no detours—it's straight from the heart and it's abundant—as friends from this country and abroad are reminded when they visit the Motz' in their delightful Virginia retirement."

THE STORY OF "DOC" MOTZ

In a way, the word "characters" which appears in this title, does not seem quite appropriate for Fred A. Motz and his lovely wife, Mary, but here we use the word attempting to describe two people who leave an indelible impression on one's memory. Although those who know them best, think of them as inseparable, nevertheless this is largely a story of "Doc" Motz as he is affectionately known by his scores of acquaintances and friends. Mary, his wife, is also a definite part of this narrative.

"Doc" Motz, in my book, throughout a long lifetime was the finest and most useful public servant ever employed by the Government in foreign fields in the interests of the fresh fruit industry of the United States. This superlative statement is only limited by the extent of my own acquaintance with foreign government representatives. In all of this endeavor his wife has been a charming and gracious hostess, adding immeasurably to his effectiveness in the principal European capitals where he worked from 1929 to his retirement in 1958. His main centers of operation were in London and Paris, but from these points his activities throughout all the nations in Western Europe were farflung and widely acceptable.

Fred "Doc" Motz was born September 12, 1893, in Crookston, Minn. His father was a native of Germany, coming to the United States at the age of 3 and acquiring his citizenship at age 21 in the year 1884 in the city of Philadelphia. His mother, Hanna Rasmussen, was born in Davenport, Iowa. "Doc" married Mary Moore at Norfolk, Va., and they have a daughter, Mary Virginia, married to Capt. A. Rasper, now located at Fort Lewis, Wash.

"Doc's early training, and education highly fitted him for his later work. He was graduated from Oregon State College at Corvallis in 1917, where he received a B.S. degree in horticulture and pomology. He accepted an offer from Virginia Polytechnic Institute at Blacksburg, Va. where he started as an extension horticulturist. During the years from 1917 to 1929 he became professor of horticulture. In that period he also acquired ownership of a 100-acre apple and peach orchard, finally resigning to enter Government service."

From September 1929 to September 1939 he was located in London, England, starting as a marketing specialist and finally as agricultural commissioner. During this 10-year stint he was engaged in planning and conducting research and service work in the field of domestic and foreign markets of agricultural products, with special reference to fruits and vegetables. He studied trade preferences, established and maintained contact with Government officials, prepared material for publication, and generally became of enormous service to producers in this country, interested in exporting fresh fruit to the United Kingdom and the Continent.

When war came in 1939 and exports were discontinued, he was assigned to basic studies of the fruit industries of Argentina, Chile, Brazil, and Mexico. In that work, which continued until 1942, he made original studies and contributed publications which were of enormous value to this country. In 1943, he served as chairman of the combined Food Board and during that year was largely instrumental in organizing the National Horticultural Council, which is still functioning quite effectively.

In 1944, he was asked to accept a position with the Austrian Mission Military Government as food and agricultural advisor to Commanding Gen. Mark W. Clark. He served 3 years as agricultural attaché and chief of the agricultural section of the military government. In 1948, he returned to the prewar fruit marketing activities with headquarters in Paris; in 1954, he was transferred back to London; and, in 1958, he retired.

To no single individual does the fruit industry of this country owe a greater debt of gratitude for stimulating exports than to "Doc" Motz. He, together with Irving J. Woodin, former general manager of the California Fruit Exchange, was responsible for the introduction of the Emperor grape to the United Kingdom and other European

markets, a business which has grown and prospered. He developed an exceedingly wide acquaintance among importers and prospective importers, not only in the United Kingdom and France, but throughout Western Europe. His title might have been "Ambassador Plenipotentiary Extraordinary."

No representative of a fruit company from this, or any other State, who looked up "Doc" Motz was ever let down. The writer, on two separate European trips, in the interests of stimulating exports, was directed by "Doc" Motz with suitable introductions to all the principal members of the trade in England, Ireland, and Scotland, as well as to the countries of Western Europe. On many occasions he accompanied me personally. He arranged conferences, opened the doors of government, initiated meetings with our agricultural attachés and State Department officials. He was equally generous with all. His intimate knowledge of fresh fruit, its packaging, and the market requirements of the foreign buyer made him perhaps especially helpful. The detailed information he passed on to fruit shippers in this country through government channels, has made the trade both here and abroad, much more alive to market requirements. This goes especially for grapes, plums, apples, citrus fruits, pears which are among the principal items in the export trade.

Gifted with an uncanny sense of commercial values, many a transaction was initiated in his fertile brain and put into action, resulting in benefit to both buyer and seller. He is loved and respected by the trade, both here and abroad, because of his intimate knowledge of the business, his unfailing courtesy, and his good humor. In his life's work, as stated before, his wife, the former Mary Watson Moore, was an invaluable asset. He met Mary in Blacksburg while at Virginia Polytechnical Institute. They were married in 1922, and "Doc" has always said this was "the best day's work I ever did." Mary has worked as hard for the fruit industry as "Doc." They both love it. It was and is their life.

It would be impossible to mention in the short confines of an article, the myriads of friends he made with the importing trade of the United Kingdom and Western Europe. But an article like this would hardly be complete without mentioning such stalwarts as John Colyer and Willie McCaig of the Fruit & Produce Exchange of Great Britain and other members of this splendid organization; of John and Bill Anderson of W. B. Anderson & Sons, Carlisle, England; of Willie Rankin of Edinburgh, Scotland; of Wilfred Sims of the London Borough Market. Then there is M. and W. Mack Ltd., George Monro, Ltd., T. Walton Ltd., Keeling and White, Ltd., Connolly Shaw Ltd., Louis Reece, J. & J. Lyons Ltd., all of London, and scores of others throughout the United Kingdom. And, of course, there is Henri Cordier of Paris, whose enormous orchard in southern France was actually laid out in part with the help of "Doc's" expert advice. Then comes a host of importers in Germany and the low countries, including Dan Pingel of J. A. Kahl Co., of Hamburg; Scipio & Fischer of the Fruchthof in Bremen; Continental Fruit Co. of Rotterdam; F. V. Hartz of Copenhagen; Joh. Bruce of Stockholm; Bernh. Botolfsen of Oslo. These and many others formed the nucleus of the importing business for which "Doc" Motz was responsible in large measure.

During all the years spent in Europe, he became a connoisseur of objects of art, including paintings, furniture, rugs, bric-a-brac and the like. Now retired, and living on a beautiful estate on tidewater country at Mathews, Va., he and his wife at long last are enjoying the beautiful treasures they collected and stored over a 25-year period. They grace their large inviting home

as though they were bought for that specific purpose. In fact, they probably were, for both "Doc" and Mary had planned their retirement carefully, even to the type of home and location to which they looked forward over a long period of years. Virginia tidewater is indeed a historic country. While the oyster bed on its shores has perhaps contributed little to past events, just across the water you can see Yorktown, famous in Colonial history, and within a short ride you are in Williamsburg, the seat of a revolutionary restoration and the home of William and Mary College, ranking with Harvard in antiquity. Their home is a mecca for many loyal friends who continue to visit them from all over the world. "Doc" and Mary Motz are now enjoying life in what, we hope, is continued good health and sheer contentment. They have both earned a high place in the regard of the fruit industry of this country.

"Doc" and Mary Motz, we salute you, and wish you every happiness in the years ahead. As you say, in your favorite expression, "keep in touch."

John O'Donnell, Veteran Newspaper Great, Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, many of us will be sorry indeed to hear that the veteran newspaper great, John O'Donnell, has put his typewriter away and retired from the arena.

Mr. O'Donnell wrote the column "Capitol Stuff" in the New York Daily News for many years. In his column he was always forthright and courageous. He could dish it out, but he could also take it, a rare attribute in a journalist, or for that matter in a human being.

The following article by Frank Holeman appeared in the New York Daily News of September 4 and relates briefly the story of John O'Donnell's colorful career:

(By Frank Holeman)

WASHINGTON, September 3.—When a general or an admiral retires, it's customary to hold a big ceremony for him with flags, drums, and a final salute from his troops.

Well, John O'Donnell, who has been chief of the Washington bureau of the News since 1933, and our "commanding officer," officially retired last Friday, September 1.

We couldn't hold a ceremony for him, because O'Donnell is in Georgetown Hospital here, seriously ill. Besides, he wouldn't stand for any sentimental guff from the hired help or anybody else.

But after all this is an important event. It isn't every day a colorful, controversial, world-famous newspaper columnist officially retires after 46 years in our business. (He has been on extended sick leave from the News since last January.)

So, I'd like to mark the occasion in some way. We could talk about the tough, sparkling column, "Capitol Stuff," which he wrote in this space, beginning in 1933. But his vigorous opinions on public issues and personalities are well known to readers of the News.

Instead, I'd like to take this opportunity to tell you some things you may not know about John O'Donnell, as a man, a boss, and

a friend. I'd like to tell you how he got in this business in the first place, instead of becoming a professional baseball player, which he nearly did.

O'Donnell was born in Somerville, Mass., a suburb of Boston, July 23, 1896. His father was Dr. Louis P. O'Donnell, a famous surgeon and X-ray specialist. His mother died when John was a boy.

PLAYED A FAST SECOND BASE

He attended parochial school in Somerville and later a district school in Meredith, N.H.

He was fired from his first newspaper job, as a columnist on the Melrose High School Life, for criticizing the local police chief's handling of sports crowds. Young John himself played a fast second base on the high school baseball team.

He went to spring training camp with the Boston Red Sox in Hot Springs, Ark., one year, along with some other schoolboy players and a fellow named Babe Ruth.

After high school graduation in 1915, young O'Donnell got a job as schoolboy sports writer on the Boston Record and filled in as a precocious sports editor. At 17, he was covering Boston police headquarters. Then he decided to go to college, entering Tufts in the fall of 1916.

When World War I came along, he tried to get into the Signal Corps Air Service but his eyes flunked him. So he entered the infantry. He emerged as a lieutenant, although he never got overseas.

MADE PHI BETA KAPPA AT TUFTS

He graduated from Tufts in 1920 with an A.B. degree and a Phi Beta Kappa key. Then he studied Shakespeare for a year at Harvard.

After college, he worked for McCall's magazine and NEA Feature Syndicate in Cleveland. In 1922 he came to New York as a drama critic and feature writer for that syndicate. He soon shifted to the old New York American as a crime reporter. In 1927, he joined the News.

During the prohibition heyday of the gangsters, O'Donnell was assigned to Legs Diamond. Legs, for some reason, wouldn't talk to anybody else. His girl friend, Kiki Roberts, once let O'Donnell turn her in to the law in Albany to face a kidnapping rap.

Readers of Capitol Stuff were accustomed to quotations from Shakespeare, "Alice in Wonderland," and other classics side by side with the brashest, most vivid lingo of the underworld and sports. It was all authentic. O'Donnell's favorite Shakespearean play was Macbeth. His favorite gangster was Legs Diamond. He could quote soliloquies from either, at the drop of a hat.

O'Donnell was sent to Washington in March 1933, to cover the first inauguration of F.D.R. The following Monday, he tried to pay his hotel bill and return to New York. But all banks were closed, under F.D.R.'s bank holiday order, and the office couldn't send him any dough.

BECAME A CORRESPONDENT BY ACCIDENT

While he was waiting, big news began to pop. The late Capt. Joseph M. Patterson, founder of the News, decided to maintain a permanent bureau in Washington. "I became a Washington correspondent because I couldn't pay my hotel bill and get out of town," O'Donnell told me once, with a grin.

In the early New Deal days, O'Donnell and his wife Doris Fleeson (they were later divorced; have a daughter, Doris) were very friendly with the administration. As World War II approached, the friendship cooled, and F.D.R. came to hate O'Donnell with a passion.

I attended the White House press conference in 1942 when F.D.R. awarded the Iron Cross to O'Donnell for his hard-hitting criticism. After the conference ended, I saw F.D.R. turn to the late Earl Godwin, a radio newsman, and hand him the German medal.

"When you see John O'Donnell," said F.D.R., "give him this."

I could hardly believe my ears, because O'Donnell was in the room all the time. He had taken me over to show me how the White House was covered.

People liked his column or they hated it, but everybody read it. He never asked anybody to agree with him. He fought with Presidents, prime ministers and the other big shots of our time. But he never used his lance against little guys.

Some people who disagreed with O'Donnell most violently on public issues became close friends because he was such a civilized companion.

I heard somebody say about another great newspaperman: "You can't buy him, you can't scare him and you can't fool him." That is John O'Donnell, a big league newspaperman.

If you want to drop him a line, his address is Georgetown Hospital, Washington, D.C.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in the Princeton Alumni Weekly of February 3, 1961, Prof. Martin Summerfield wrote an article entitled "The Case for Federal Aid," in which he argued that the Federal Government should assume a material share of the responsibility for the general support of colleges and universities. Roger A. Freeman, research director of the Institute for Studies in Federalism at Claremont Men's College in Claremont, Calif., was prevailed upon to reply to Mr. Summerfield's article. Mr. Freeman did, and excerpts of his reply appeared in the summer edition of the University, a Princeton magazine.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal of controversy has always accompanied the issue of Federal aid to education and this session of Congress has been no different. Many eloquent arguments have been advanced on both sides and if they have accomplished nothing else, they have served to focus the attention of all Members of Congress, as well as the general public, on the major, vital issues of this proposed bill.

It is no mystery to the Members of this House or to the Members of the other body or to the American people that the Federal Government has overstepped itself many times over in the expenditure of moneys it does not possess. "Why," asks Mr. Freeman, "has it—the Federal Government—been unable to raise enough revenues to meet its expenditures more than 80 percent of the time in over 30 years, with a cumulative deficit that averages \$9 billion annually? If, on the other hand, the Federal Government already is trying to bite off more than it can chew, as the record suggests, why give it additional responsibilities? What taxing authority, is it claimed, does the Federal Government have which the States do not also possess?"

Mr. Freeman, in his reply to Professor Summerfield's "The Case for Federal Aid," has done an outstanding service to the opponents of Federal aid in that he very clearly lists and clarifies the many overwhelming reasons why Federal aid to education is impractical, undesirable and unnecessary. It is for this reason that I commend Mr. Freeman's article to all Members of Congress and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Freeman is well qualified to discuss the problems of financing education. Roger A. Freeman, research director of the Institute for Studies in Federalism at Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif., directed the research for the Study Committee on Federal Responsibility in the Field of Education of the U.S. Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in 1953-55, was consultant on school finance to the White House Conference on Education and has served on the White House staff and as assistant to the Governor of the State of Washington. For the past 4 years he has been chairman of the Committee on the Financing of Public Education of the National Tax Association. He just completed a research project on the financing of the public schools whose results were published in two volumes: "I—School Needs in the Decade Ahead," "II—Taxes for the Schools," The Institute for Social Science Research, Washington, D.C., 1958 and 1960.

The article follows:

THE MISSING CASE FOR FEDERAL AID

(By Roger A. Freeman)

In "The Case for Federal Aid" (Princeton Alumni Weekly, Feb. 3, 1961) Prof. Martin Summerfield argued that the Federal Government ought to assume a material share of the responsibility for the general support of colleges and universities. The article is one of many treatises, ranging from the learned to the demagogic, which have been written in an effort to convince the American public that Federal aid to education is desirable and necessary.

The issue has been explored, considered, and debated time and again. Some study groups, such as President Roosevelt's Advisory Committee on Education in 1938, recommended Federal aid to schools and colleges, other groups have taken an equivocal stand, while still others have opposed it. The Commission on Financing Higher Education, sponsored by the Association of American Universities in 1952, left no doubt of its position. In the words of one of the commission members, President Carter Davidson of Union College, Schenectady: "One broad highway to financial security the members of the commission viewed unanimously as the primrose path that leads to the everlasting bonfire. This road was named Federal Government support. . . . There was a feeling that increased Government support from Federal sources was not only a blind alley, but also blinded those who traveled down it."

It has been a puzzle to many observers why Congress has not enacted a program of general support for schools and colleges in the hundred or so years that the debate over Federal responsibility in education has been going on although it has seen fit meanwhile to authorize a thousandfold increase in the national budget. Foreign visitors, accustomed to a more centralized government, often admit inability to comprehend the reasons behind the American penchant for keeping education local.

Protagonists of Federal aid tend to attribute their lack of success to prejudice against education or suspicion of educators ("eggheads") among politicians. They blame their defeats on reactionaries on Capitol Hill who, they feel, eventually will have to be dragged, kicking and screaming, into the 20th century.

On the whole, the argument for Federal aid has changed little in a hundred years. Some of the speeches delivered in the U.S. Senate in the 1870's and 1880's could have been given yesterday, with but a few adjustments in the statistics. Professor Summerfield uses a partly novel approach. Low salaries in our academic institutions, he holds, are forcing faculty members to seek supplemental income through research contracts, consulting, and other means which divert their interest from teaching to contract-getting. This corrupts wide segments of our universities. The institutions are unable to raise salaries to an appropriate level because their established sources of support, State governments and private donors, cannot, or will not raise sufficient funds. So, Mr. Summerfield reasons, "the logical source of funds seems to be the Federal Government, the only entity that can provide large sums for national purposes, the only entity that has a taxing authority commensurate with the job to be done."

This suggests some pertinent questions: If the Federal Government has a taxing authority commensurate with its job, why has it been unable to raise enough revenues to meet its expenditures more than 80 percent of the time in our 30 years, with a cumulative deficit that averages \$9 billion annually? If, on the other hand, the Federal Government already is trying to bite off more than it can chew, as the record suggests, why give it additional responsibilities? What taxing authority, is it claimed, does the Federal Government have which the States do not also possess? What types of income, property or transactions can it tax which are not located within the boundaries of the 50 States and subject to their taxing powers? What makes the Federal Government such a "logical source of funds" when it seems incapable of financing its established activities, and when it has consistently refused to assume responsibility for education while the States have multiplied their educational appropriations beyond expectations? Is it because Federal money is believed to come for free from an inexhaustible National Treasury? Are State tax systems inadequate to meet requirements? "The 'weakness' of State and local taxing systems lies the impact of heavy Federal taxes" advised New Jersey Gov. Robert B. Meyner a congressional committee. Can we improve this situation by placing further burdens on the National Government?

TOO MUCH SPONSORED RESEARCH?

Professor Summerfield cites low salaries as proof that the established financing arrangements are inadequate. He asserts that an immediate consequence of the low salary schedule is the widespread practice of "consulting" which forces faculty members to become "contractor getters" and corrupts them and their institutions.

If it be true that college teachers accept—or hunt for—research projects because of low salaries, why is it that, as a rule, the best paid professors at the institutions with the highest salary scales hold the most numerous and juiciest research contracts while lowly paid instructors and assistant professors, and low-paying institutions in general, receive far less of the manna from heaven? Is it not likely that the magnitude and location of sponsored research is governed by factors other than the salary level? Does it not appear that, by and large, the job is seeking the man rather than the man seeking the job?

In his provocative article "The Affluent Professors" (the Reporter, June 23, 1960), Spencer Klaw observed correctly: "The need to supplement low academic salaries is only one of the reasons why professors consult. When a group of sociologists were asked a few years back about their extracurricular activities, more than 90 percent of those who consulted said that even if their salaries were much higher they would go on doing so. Professors point out that consulting can be exciting, intellectually stimulating, and good for their teaching."

It is unlikely that even a sharp rise in college salaries would reduce the practice of consulting to a significant extent. Dexter Keezer, of McGraw-Hill, estimated (in a paper presented at the 1959 American Economic Association meeting) that the research expenditures of the Federal Government would rise from \$7.2 billion in 1959 to \$12.4 billion in 1969. He projected the share of colleges and institutions to climb from 14 percent of the total in 1959 to 20 percent in 1969. In absolute terms Federal research funds for higher education would rise from \$1 to \$2.5 billion. Is this undesirable? Would it be in the interest of the Nation, of defense or of education to channel all or most of these funds to Government laboratories and private industry? Is it not more likely that all parties benefit under the present arrangements? Is there a necessary conflict between the sponsored research and the objectives of academic institutions?

Gen. James McCormack and Vincent A. Fuller of MIT said in a paper on "Federal Sponsorship of University Research" prepared for the American Assembly in 1960 that "the central incompatibilities are not severe and can, with understanding management, be turned into strengths. Society would be the loser if government administration failed to use university research resources or proceeded to use them without comprehending the educational forces which dominate the academic community. The university would be the loser if it seriously inhibited the access of its science and engineering faculty and students to the powerful technologies of our time, in which government is often crucial to meaningful participation. Sponsored research is a desirable aspect of university life, not because it is free of basic conflicts, but because the area of mutual interest between sponsors and universities far overshadows the area of conflict."

Professor Summerfield states "that the injection of half a billion in contract money into the universities may be a good way to buy the research that the Government needs but a poor way to support education." He warns "Let us not confuse, as we are now doing, the service we offer the Nation with the business of getting money for the university." Who seems to be doing the confusing is Mr. Summerfield. Universities have long complained that Government-sponsored research does not pay its way and is a drain on their resources rather than support. Chancellor C. C. Furnas and Vice Chancellor Raymond Ewell of the University of Buffalo wrote: "In order to uphold their end of the research function, universities are being forced into deficit financing simply because those who are supposed to be supporting research are not paying the full bill." They charged that the Armed Forces are short-changing the institutions but that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the National Science Foundation are the worst offenders.

Mr. Summerfield's attempt to blame some of the other extracurricular activities of college professors on the present system of educational finance is no more convincing.

My heart does not bleed for professors who, according to Mr. Summerfield are "systematically engaged in stock market ventures or real estate trading" because I know

some of them. They regard such extracurricular escapades as a fate far less worse than death, and are not sorry for themselves, save in times when the Dow-Jones drops or land prices sag. Some even tell me that they like business ventures on the side, and, in fact, the experience of having to meet a payroll may elevate their understanding of the practical workings of our economic system. I could name some to whom such an experience could prove most beneficial.

HIGHER SALARIES AND COLLEGE EFFICIENCY

All of this does not mean that colleges should not continue to boost faculty salaries. Better pay for academic work is an urgent and most worthy objective. But the solution is not simply a "direct across-the-board support of higher education" by the Federal Government, as Mr. Summerfield suggests. It is a strange fact that so many academicians are unable to see the connection between the effectiveness with which college resources are used and their level of pay. Executives in private industry seldom suffer from such myopia. But then, an industry which utilized its skilled staff and costly facilities as inadequately and wastefully as colleges would have been bankrupt long ago.

In its "Better Utilization of College Teaching Resources," the fund for the advancement of education outlined four handles to attack the problem of increased efficiency: place greater responsibility on students for their education, rearrange course structures, discover new resources both in teaching and in performance of duties ordinarily expected of the teacher, and increase the institutional reach of colleges and universities.

When will institutions be ready to abandon the superstition that a low faculty-student ratio is a measure of quality? "All that is accomplished [by low ratios] is to enable the teacher to communicate his mediocrity in an intimate environment" commented the late President Charles Johnson of Fisk University. All over the country the faculty-student ratio has been falling in recent decades and is now far lower—approximately half—of what it is in European universities. Hundreds of studies and experiments have failed to show an advantage of small classes over large. Also, an outstanding course on TV, once on tape, such as the famous White physics course can be taught to hundreds at a fraction of the cost of live instruction.

Most institutions keep spoon feeding their students just because high schools fail to train them adequately in the essential skills nor teach them study habits. Could not higher admission standards force the common schools to shift from more pleasurable pursuits to the grim business of education? Is there any reason why our institutions of higher learning should not place upon the student more responsibility for getting an education, as universities do throughout the rest of the world?

In a recent survey of several studies Samuel Baskin reported in a booklet "Quest for Quality," published by the U.S. Office of Education "The data from the present experimentation in independent study seem clear on this point: Students are able to learn as well with much less classtime than we have been accustomed to require of them."

Why must we continue the fantastic proliferation of the curriculum which Seymour Harris, head of the Harvard Economics Department called "a scandal from the viewpoint of both economics and education"? I wonder what Mr. Khrushchev thought when on visiting Iowa State University he was shown a class in ironing? But then maybe we were lucky he did not drop in on courses in flycasting, family camping or bachelor living.

Beardsley Ruml and Donald Morrison (both since deceased) proposed in their book "Memo to a College Trustee," prepared for the Fund for the Advancement of Education 2 years ago, to trim the curriculum and to double the number of students per faculty member, from the present 8 or 9 to about 20. This would enable the institutions to double salaries without additional funds. The authors concluded that "new money is not needed in anything like the amounts presently estimated. Many of the necessary funds are already at the disposal of the college or can be made so; but they are being dissipated through wastes in curriculum, wastes in methods of instruction, wastes in administration, and in the use of property and plant."

We have stretched 12 to 13 years of education and spread them over 16 or more years. This fritters away the institutions' resources, and the students' time. It postpones their earnings career and leads to numerous other difficulties.

Columbia University President Grayson Kirk wrote an article in the Saturday Evening Post that "College Should Not Take 4 Years" but be compressed into 3. Chancellor Edward H. Litchfield of the University of Pittsburgh pioneered the trimester plan which keeps the plant in operation the year round and enables students to obtain a B.A. degree in 3 years. A few other institutions are now using or considering similar plans. Why should this not become more general? Dean Elmer Easton of Rutgers' Engineering College pointed out in a booklet, "Year-Around Operation of Colleges," that such a schedule would provide up to 56 percent more degrees, per year, make up to 30 percent more use of instructional facilities, increase faculty salaries approximately 30 percent.

PLANT NEEDS AND SPACE UTILIZATION

The need for additional college facilities is sometimes pictured to be staggering. A study of the American Council of Education by John D. Long and J. B. Black placed the 1958-70 requirements at \$11 to \$14 billion. A U.S. Office of Education report by W. Robert Bokelman and John B. Roark set the 1956-70 needs at \$17 billion (\$7.1 billion for academic, \$5.3 billion for residential facilities, \$4.8 billion for replacement, rehabilitation, and repair). But several studies have shown the present inadequate use of college facilities. A recent M.S.U. survey of 100 schools placed the utilization, on the basis of a 44-hour week at 46 percent of capacity; at only 25 percent of capacity in terms of student stations.

Space utilization analysis, a group of management consultants who have done work for several universities, government, and industry, placed the 1957-70 facility requirements of American colleges and universities at \$12.7 billion under current space utilization practices but estimated that with better space programming in new buildings the amount could be cut to \$7.2 billion, with such practices in all (new and old) buildings to \$4.3 billion.

The above-mentioned ACE and USOE estimates call for annual plant expenditures slightly over \$1 billion. Outlays for physical plant of all colleges and universities totaled \$417 million in 1950, \$685 million in 1956, and exceeded \$1 billion in 1958. There is no indication that the construction boom in higher education is about to collapse. With national income and product expected to climb another 40 or 50 percent in the 1960's, what reason do we have to believe that the established sources will not be able to meet all essential requirements for plant funds?

ARE TOO FEW GOING TO COLLEGE OR TOO MANY?

A more fundamental question may be raised about the desirability and potential effect of sending two-fifths—and if current trends continue much longer, one-half—of

our young people to college. Few of the culturally leading countries have as much as 10 percent of their youth in higher educational institutions. Do they all fail to meet their professional manpower needs?

It may at first glance appear to be encouraging that, under current projections, between 1930 and 1970 the population of the United States will have grown 72 percent, the college-age population 18-21) 61 percent while college enrollment and the number of degrees granted will have jumped 500 percent. But will it really advance the Nation's welfare that in our eagerness to make everybody fit for college we have made college fit everybody? "Are we going to get fewer sheep just by handing out more sheepskins?" asked Fordham President Father Gannon a few years ago.

Seymour Harris concluded in 1948 "that we may be turning out too many graduates and that there is a danger not only of a relative but of absolute deterioration—falling income and employment" ("How Shall We Pay for Education?" p. 67). While employment has absolutely risen there has been a relative decline in the earnings of professional workers. David Blank and George Stigler pointed out in their book, "Demand and Supply of Scientific Personnel" that supply has been rising faster than demand and that scientific earnings have been drifting downward in relation to manual workers, as census statistics also show and as academicians well know.

In a more recent paper for the National Manpower Council's Arden House Conference in November 1959, Professor Harris predicted that it will not be easy to find openings for an average of a half million college graduates in the next 10 years in management and the professions. They may find jobs but at depressed wages. What this country needs is not more college graduates but better qualified ones who are more broadly educated and thoroughly trained. Our present love affair with numbers may be leading us into a blind alley.

Over the past 20 years professional workers have lost 15 to 20 percent in earnings compared with manual workers. In the next 10 years the population of the United States will grow 18 percent, and the number of new degrees is projected to rise 75 percent. What impact will this have on the wages of the average graduate? Is it not time to do some rethinking of investment in marginal prospects for higher education. Gary Becker's study for the National Bureau of Economic Research raises some weighty questions in regard to comparative rates of return (American Economic Review, May 1960).

WHO SHOULD PICK UP THE CHECK?

No matter how successful colleges and universities may be in using their resources more wisely and more effectively, they will still need to boost their income very substantially. Some have estimated that funds ought to be doubled while others want them tripled. Such increases are well within the realm of possibility if Government spending for other purposes does not get out of hand. The higher education budget has multiplied 12 times in the past 20 years—from half a billion to about \$6 billion. This is an encouraging trend.

What indication is there that the States will not continue to expand their financial resources and educational appropriations? Since World War II the national income has risen 118 percent, State and local governments revenues 256 percent. The revenues of the National Government meanwhile increased only 68 percent; its finances spurt ahead only in wartime.

Private giving also has shown a splendid growth. Why should students and their parents, as well as private donors, not be able to augment their contributions as incomes rise and particularly if the Federal Government keeps its budget under control and grants tax relief?

The most neglected source of higher educational income is tuition payments in State institutions. Most State colleges and universities charge no or low tuition, or mere token fees. It has at times been charged that the American people spend more on liquor and tobacco than on education. This is incorrect except for many students at State colleges and universities who spend more on cigarettes than on payments to their alma mater, and far larger amounts for cars, liquor, and various forms of entertainment.

It has been suggested that higher tuition fees might ease the parking problem around certain campuses. It is, of course, possible that some of our students would rather part with college than their car. If so, why should they not be allowed to spend their time as well as their money according to their own set of values?

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching suggested in its 1956-57 report:

"Private institutions may eventually have to charge the full cost of education in tuition. They can then go even further than they have to date in providing various forms of scholarship aid for those students who need it." Grants and loan scholarship funds from State and private sources have shown a healthy growth and may be expected to expand further unless the Federal Government decides to enter the field with a major program which would tend to dry up other sources. Private finance companies are now advertising loans for college students. Most promising is the plan by the College Life Insurance Co. of America and the Foundation for Voluntary Welfare to set up guarantees for student loans for educational purposes. Some observers however frown on what they call students mortgaging their future although they find no objection to no downpayments on large purchases and debts for more mundane purposes.

Numerous proposals have been submitted which would permit students and their parents to offset part or all college expenses on the Federal income tax through additional exemptions, deductions, or tax credits. This would make higher tuition fees easier to bear. Students from families which pay little or no income tax would still be eligible for scholarships. Donations to institutions could also be encouraged by a more liberal form of income tax credit.

Why do those who believe financial aid from the National Government to be necessary not support such proposals? Tax credits would eliminate the controversial problem of an equitable allocation of governmental grants among public, private nonsectarian, and sectarian institutions and leave the freedom of choice to students and their parents, as the GI bill did. If Mr. Summerfield feels that the support of higher education has become a national problem that calls for action by the National Government, why does he not even refer to plans which would use the fiscal powers of the National Government without disturbing the structure of higher education?

The President's proposals to the 87th Congress suggest loans and grants for facilities but not the "across the board" aid which Mr. Summerfield calls for. This program, if enacted would not raise faculty salaries.

In conclusion then, there are these three ways of meeting higher education's financial needs: greater funds from established sources and wiser use of those funds; Federal income tax credits; Federal direct grants. But the worst of these is Federal grants.

Why this would be the worst method and what the dangers are in Federal aid was pointed out by George C. S. Benson, president of Claremont Men's College, and John M. Payne in a booklet, "National Aid to Higher Education" (American Enterprises Association, Washington, D.C., 1958).

Coal Research and Nuclear Processes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been much controversy concerning the item in the Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill for the power generating facility in connection with the Government's nuclear reactor at Hanford, Wash. This matter, and another item of \$5 million for coal research through application of nuclear processes, represent the points of difference between the House and Senate versions of H.R. 7576 now in conference.

I supported the Hanford project during House action on the measure, but this body voted to delete it from the bill. The Senate restored it and also, on motion of the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD] and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], added to H.R. 7576 the amendment to authorize the \$5 million coal research project by the Atomic Energy Commission. Both Senators from West Virginia voted with the majority in that body for restoration of the Hanford power project.

Meanwhile, there was pending in the Senate a resolution introduced by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and cosponsored by 62 other Senators, including the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], to provide for a national fuels and energy study by a Senate committee. This legislation—Senate Resolution 105—was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and is believed to be scheduled for what is hoped will be favorable Senate action before adjournment of this session.

The Fairmont (W. Va.) Times, in its issue of August 29, 1961, published an editorial in discussion of these pending legislative matters which is both pertinent and cogent. It very appropriately commends the statesmanship and effectiveness of the Senators from West Virginia in their handling of these problems in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the Fairmont Times to which reference has been made.

RANDOLPH GETS A RESOLUTION THROUGH

Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, recently called a recess in the attacks on U.S. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH for his support of a proposed nuclear reactor at Hanford, Wash., to praise him lavishly for getting a resolution for a national fuels study through the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RANDOLPH and his colleague from West Virginia, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, initially introduced the resolution, and obtained threescore other Senators as cosponsors. Its endorsement by the committee is tantamount to its approval by the full Senate, which means that the study will start, in all probability, soon after adjournment of the present session of Congress.

The resolution itself is the legislation for which the National Coal Policy Conference was originally created to promote. Since the study will be made by a standing committee of the Senate instead of a special group set up for the purpose, any legislation it deems advisable to recommend can be prepared without going through the more complicated machinery that a separate investigation would entail.

The efforts exerted by RANDOLPH and BYRD in behalf of the resolution are the most conclusive proof that they have not "sold the coal industry of West Virginia for peanuts," as some of their Republican critics are repetitiously insisting in the hope of making a campaign issue for next year and 1964.

It will take all the political acumen and powers of persuasion at RANDOLPH's command, however, to offset some of the damage that has been done by the bitter attacks on the Hanford proposal. The Interior Committee is headed by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON of New Mexico, a former Secretary of Agriculture, and its ranking majority member is Senator HENRY M. JACKSON of Washington, the State in which the Hanford generating plant is proposed to be located.

Senators from Nevada, Colorado, Idaho, Alaska, Utah, North Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, Hawaii, California, Arizona, and Iowa make up the rest of the standing committee. Not one of them comes from a major coal-producing State and their interests lie more in such things as the Hanford project than the protection of the bituminous industry.

Three Senators, RANDOLPH among them, are scheduled to be added to the committee for the purposes of the fuels study. This means he not only will have to convince his fellow Members that the Nation's coal interests are not blindly prejudiced against every proposal which does not redound to their immediate benefit, but will have also to sell his colleagues on coal's story.

Perhaps RANDOLPH's vote for the Hanford project "in the national interest" also was one way of telling the western Senators that each constituency has its own problems worthy of consideration.

Leaving aside the partisan political attacks on RANDOLPH and the others who voted for Hanford, the National Coal Association and the United Mine Workers of America must surely realize that a prolongation of the bitter dispute will render less likely their chances of being able to present testimony in connection with the fuels study in a favorable climate.

Even if everything that has been said against the Hanford job is true, the coal industry and its allies could well afford to trade it for the establishment of a national fuels policy. It seems to us that regulation of residual oil and "dumped" natural gas on terms that the coal industry can live with is, on balance, far more essential than what becomes of waste steam produced by a plutonium generator in the Pacific Northwest.

Hon. Eugene Keogh

**SPEECH
OF**

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this tribute to the Honorable EUGENE KEOGH in celebration of his 25 years as a Member of the House of Representatives—and also his birthday. He is a distinguished legislator and a fine lawyer.

As a new Member of the House, I came here in the 86th Congress, and I was advised by his many friends throughout the great State of New York to see him. The scholar that he is, he advised me wisely on many occasions on the procedures in the House. Mr. KEOGH is quiet in his ways, but impressive and convincing in his deliberations. His actions and fine record should be an inspiration to all new Members coming into the House of Representatives.

My life has been enriched and my work has been more interesting because of my acquaintance with Mr. KEOGH. May God in His divine wisdom grant him many happy years with his family and friends, and may he continue to enjoy many fruitful years in his legislative work.

Congratulations and best wishes on this momentous occasion.

World Developments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, Americans are showing ever-increasing concern over world developments. Surely, this is reflected in the volume and content of mail pouring into congressional offices.

One of my constituents, Mr. Robert W. Capps, of Lancaster, expresses the sentiment of a large segment of Americans. His letter follows:

The Berlin situation is getting worse by the day, and it is a matter of only a spark to set the whole thing beyond the conference table talk. Why talk further with Khrushchev anyway for we already have a signed Russian agreement, and any more signed agreements would be no better than the one we now have. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics do not honor any treaty or agreement of any nature regardless—if it suits their purpose to do otherwise. We know that is the truth, so I rather agree with Charles de Gaulle, stay away from further conferences with Khrushchev, and hew to the line we have already laid down, and if war it is to be then he, Khrushchev, is the one that brings it on, for it is Khrushchev that has caused all this present commotion on Berlin, and it is he that has made all the threats. I do not agree with some statements made by men of prominence, that there will be no war over Berlin. There is a matter of principle involved here that the Western Alliance cannot but defend, for to do otherwise would be complete capitulation all down the line. Khrushchev is playing for high stakes, and he knows better than anyone else what he has to gain if the Western Alliance can be broken down over this Berlin issue, then the Communist world has little resistance left in its way. The free world will stand or fall upon what decision they make here in Berlin, and it is that simple. Again I want to cheer Charles de Gaulle for his adamant stand against the show of any weakness by importing Khrushchev for a conference. And he took this stand even as against suggestions for such a meeting by the others of the Western Alliance. As of this moment it is like a game of chess, one false move

and the game is either won or lost. We are at this very moment much closer to actual war than we have been at any previous time in our country's history. The assassination of just one man (Crown Prince Ferdinand) in a small town called Sarajevo, was all that was required to spark the start of World War I. It was only hours after this man died that Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany ordered a state of war. The daily news bulletins from Berlin can be watched with care, for it is here that the caldron is boiling with all the ingredients of violence, and the fate of far more than the 2 million souls now residents in West Berlin is at stake. The fate of the free world is on the test, and just one throw of the dice could ring down the curtain. I do hope that President Kennedy has the fortitude to stand firm, and it will take nerves of steel to carry him through the test that lies ahead. For Khrushchev baited and set this trap in Berlin and he has studied his moves to entice the prey into the midst of his ensnarement. Daily you note, one by one, he is adding more snares. He is testing the nerves of NATO and he will continue to the brink. This is his goal, and his leadership of the Communist world is also in the stakes that are being here tested—win or lose.

Cuts to Foreign Aid Bill Should Be Restored

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in opposition to the amounts recommended by the Committee on Appropriations for mutual security during fiscal 1962. I am in support of those who would restore the 21-percent cut made in the amounts provided and passed by this very Chamber less than a week ago.

Now I have read in many newspapers during the last few days that the terms of the authorization bill somehow "morally commit" the House to restore these cuts. No such thing. The basic legislative intent of section 202(b) of S. 983 was clearly developed on the floor just last Thursday in a colloquy between the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. MORGAN]. At that time they both agreed that the President of the United States had stated the case clearly at his press conference the day before, when, in answer to a question from a reporter as to whether he thought there would be at least a moral obligation to make the full appropriation, he said: "No. I would think that the Appropriations Committee would have to make their own—meet their own responsibilities." In other words, the action last week of the Committee on Appropriations as expressed in the bill before us, in no way violates the terms of the authorization bill. In short, because the record clearly knows that the percentage cut under previously enacted foreign aid authorizations is not at all a break with tradition, we are getting exactly what some of us asked for.

Anticipation of such action compelled me to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND]. Moreover, the bill before us serves to further sustain my original bewilderment at the "wholly satisfactory" evaluation of the authorization bill by the President last week.

If, according to the terms of the authorization bill, we are not morally committed to restore these cuts, then what? Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that we should rather be committed to sustaining the collective judgment of the members of the legislative committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who deliberated for months on the authorization bill. We should further be committed to supporting the judgment of the members of the conference committee, who laboriously compromised with the committee from the other Chamber, in arriving at what they thought were justified authorizations. Last but not least, there are 260 of us who, just 5 short days ago, voted for the level of authorizations contained in the conference report—and at least that number should feel constrained to sustaining their own respective personal judgments in this matter. It is in this direction that our moral commitments lie. To act otherwise would be sheer ambivalence.

In recent weeks I have heard a lot of talk about the constitutional prerogatives of the legislative branch with respect to the powers to appropriate. I think it is about time some of us started worrying about the vanishing powers of our legislative committees, whose recommended authorizations to appropriate are carrying less and less meaning with the Congress each year. I have long maintained that it is precisely for this reason that the executive branch, together with many disillusioned members of our legislative committees, have seen fit to support measures that would bypass the annual appropriations process. This trend will stop only when some of the powers of the purse are restored to their rightful legislative owners.

Mr. Speaker, we have that opportunity now.

Why Talk of Enemy So Softly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the following column by Constantine Brown which appeared in the Washington Star of September 2 is of special significance in view of the fact that Mr. Brown is in Italy and has had occasion to listen to the Voice of America:

WHY TALK OF ENEMY SO SOFTLY?—SOFT-PEDALING OF FREE WORLD MESSAGE SEEN IN BROADCASTS TO CAPTIVE PEOPLES

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME, ITALY.—The dullness of Voice of America broadcasts is surpassed only by the

dreariness of the propaganda radio behind the Iron Curtain. While the Ed Murrow organization spreads the American story to various countries by treating them to tape recording containing dull generalities about freedom and the nobility of man (mostly from such men as Senators HUMPHREY and FULBRIGHT), the Reds are equally boring with their denunciations of "warmongering Americans."

Obviously, attacks against the Red oligarchy are not considered conducive to peace in our time, or the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means. Hence, speeches or statements by "reactionary" Americans, such as Senators BRIDGES, GOLDWATER, THURMOND, DODD, and LONG, must be taboo. This, at least, is this reporter's conclusion after having heard a whole month of VOA broadcasts while in Germany and Switzerland recently. There are the inevitable gentle slaps at the Soviets by some of the VOA editorialists. But they carry nowhere near the weight which the above-mentioned Senators carry.

Foreigners, and particularly Germans, listen with genuine interest to what America has to say—particularly those in the legislative branch of Government. They follow with an interest akin to anxiety the dispatches from Washington.

I found no German, or for that matter any other European, who doubts the sincerity of President Kennedy's line of sternness toward Moscow. But equally, I found nobody who does not ask, "How can we reconcile what your President tells us with what his own important party leaders and especially the chairman of the most important Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. FULBRIGHT, says in public, on the floor of the Senate and in radio and television interviews?"

The suspicions of what may be termed a schizophrenic foreign policy started some time ago when Senator MANSFIELD, the majority leader, and later Senator FULBRIGHT urged negotiations on Berlin after Mr. Kennedy had taken a formally strong stand on that very matter.

And I found many Germans in responsible positions both in the government and newspaper profession, who wondered why Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate's most important committee, had used his power and taken the initiative in demanding that the Defense Department muzzle the generals and admirals who were denouncing the Soviet regime and communism. I noted raised eyebrows on this subject even among some Frenchmen who believe as firmly as we do in the civilian control of the military.

The order was directed at men who may have the responsibility to lead their men in battle against the enemy. They were not guilty of any political activity; they were merely preparing their men for a tragic eventuality when they would be asked to risk their lives.

Parenthetically, I add that while listening to a Frankfurt military station broadcast of a blow-by-blow description of war games I found the commentator describing the operation of an advanced unit never said "We are now attacking the enemy." The word enemy was replaced by the obviously diplomatic expression "aggressor."

It is difficult for the hard-bitten European military to understand why the generals can no longer indoctrinate their troops against the Communists who have been, in fact, declared enemies by Commander in Chief Kennedy himself. Before the last war the French and British also neglected to indoctrinate their forces. The result was disastrous for the French, at least. Their men believed they were fighting to save Poland. Their spirit was not in it and they fought badly. Not until they went down in defeat and General de Gaulle began his national movement from England did the new French forces realize that they were fighting for the survival of France as a free nation.

Are we going to allow our defense forces to believe that they may be fighting to save Berlin for Germany? That deduction is implied if the full truth of the Communist worldwide conspiracy is not brought with full force to the attention of the men in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Or are there two policies in the United States? That of the Chief Executive, strongly backed by the American people, and the other by a few influential Members of Congress and certain "invisible men" in the administration? This question was asked of this reporter by many substantial men all over Europe who, by virtue of their positions, have wide knowledge about our official commitments.

There is an inclination on the part of questioners to believe that the appeasers are still firmly in the saddle. How else, they ask, could it be explained that at the time Mr. Kennedy made his first two statements regarding our policy toward the Kremlin, Senator FULBRIGHT came out flatly urging negotiations.

Strangely enough, we are now on the road to negotiating what used to be described as "nonnegotiable." It is obvious, say those who have closely followed developments in the United States since Mr. Kennedy's return from his talk with Mr. Khrushchev in Vienna, that the appeasers are winning the first game.

Power and Popularity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Marguerite Higgins is most timely and as usual Miss Higgins is very adept at untangling the web of Soviet intrigue and deceit, and uncovering the amazing and pathetic naivete of the United States of America.

Will we ever realize that it is better to be respected than liked, and that we are far more likely to be liked if, and when, we are respected.

If we do not learn this truth soon the words quoted in the article may indeed come true and Americans will be fighting on Cape Cod:

POWER AND POPULARITY

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—One of the chief weapons of the neutralists in cudgeling the West has, of course, been a threat that, stripped to its essentials, says: "Give me what I want when I want it or I'll sidle even closer to Moscow." That is why, from the point of view of either veteran neutralists like Egypt's Nasser or newcomers like Tunisia's Bourguiba, it was most inconsiderate of Premier Khrushchev to announce resumption of nuclear tests only hours before the so-called nonbloc countries were to gather together in Belgrade to confer. For by the nuclear test announcement the Russian leader tainted the neutralist threat of cozying up to Moscow, turning it into a dirty weapon full of psychological fallout and difficult of service to nations who, in public gatherings, prize a high moral tone as much as playing off West against East.

And despite a certain number of neutralist proclamations of shock, how much of a propaganda victory has Mr. Khrushchev in reality handed the West? More important, what practical purpose will this victory serve? Could it, from the point of view of

the struggle to contain Communist expansionism, boomerang against the West by underlining the fact that the Russians are immune to popular pressures (when they don't serve Communist purposes)? Will this renewed emphasis of an old fact of international life (remember Hungary?) merely inspire the neutrals to redouble their efforts to wring concessions for peace from the West, since only the West cares enough for propaganda victories to make real sacrifices on the behalf of such victories?

Six months will be required really to tell the tale, but President Nkrumah, of Ghana, in his address to the Belgrade Neutralist Conference gave a glimpse of attitudes to come. Although he too spoke of shock at the Soviet announcement, this did not prevent him from promoting the Soviet line all the way on the crucial question of Germany and Berlin.

As to the West, the surprise with which the man in the street greeted the Soviet announcement is a tribute to the Kremlin's psychological skill but the real triumph was the gullibility over the years of those who ought to know better, especially the scientists and diplomats.

In this connection, it is important to point out that it takes many many months to prepare nuclear test experiments. With regard to the latest Soviet test series, this is all the more true because the experimental site is a new one in far Siberia near Outer Mongolia. This meant that massive transfer of equipment, instruments, weapons, fortifications, etc., had to take place before the tests could start.

But as late as May and June, while the Soviet test preparations were in full swing, Soviet scientists and diplomats, with a dutiful bow to hypocrisy, were carrying on a subtle campaign of telling westerners "confidentially" that Russia—despite its outward intransigence—was really anxious to avoid testing. They tried to give a certain credibility to this thesis by spreading the word—even more confidentially—that the real reason Russia did not want to test was fear that experiments might bring pressure from the Chinese for Soviet atomic secrets.

But as a Polish Communist put it; "You Westerners are too complicated. There is a simple reason why Moscow halted tests. It is a reason provided by the United States, which has stated repeatedly that it is head of the Russians in sophistication of weapons [reducing the nuclear warheads into more manageable shapes and sizes]. When both sides halted tests, Moscow thought this would handicap your side far more than theirs. Did you really think the Russians would agree to something like a test ban if it would leave the United States ahead of them in any field of weapons? They needed time at the drawing boards and in laboratory tests to catch up. Now the time has come when they have to put their new formulas to the test. To them being ahead of the United States is more important than what Nehru thinks."

Mr. Khrushchev's priority of power over popularity (when the choice is necessary) is, of course, straight out of the Soviet book. Those American diplomats who quiver and quake at the thought of an adverse vote in the United Nations would do well to look at history from 1945 to 1950 when the Soviet Union repeatedly came out the loser in United Nations balloting. This adverse vote did not inhibit Josef Stalin from expanding his empire in those 5 years at the rate of 50 square miles an hour.

But these saddening reminders are useful only if they help put Washington's almost giddy emphasis on propaganda victories in some perspective. In the Berlin crisis, for instance, it was seriously claimed by a prominent State Department official that the Soviet erection of a Chinese wall in mid-Berlin

and the imprisonment of 1,100,000 previously semifree East Berliners (free to cross over to West Berlin or West Germany) was a propaganda victory.

But as one hardheaded European put it: "Five more 'victories' like that last one in Berlin and you Americans will be fighting on Cape Cod."

Is Defense Department Sitting Out Fight Against Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Evening Tribune, dated Thursday, August 31, 1961:

IS DEFENSE DEPARTMENT SITTING OUT FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM?

The mission of the Defense Department, as its name clearly indicates, is to defend the United States.

The overriding threat in America today against which we must defend ourselves with every resource at hand is communism.

If the mission of the Defense Department and the U.S. Government is not to fight communism and defend and uphold our Constitution, we would like to know who changed the mission.

Certainly, the American people did not change it.

The threat of communism is total. It doesn't menace just a section of America, or a particular group of our people, or a political party. The target marked for destruction is even bigger than the Nation. It is the whole concept of freedom and the dignity of man that has come to full flower under our Constitution and the free enterprise system.

This total threat demands a total defensive response by the people, the Government, and the military. We've all got to be in this together.

But the Defense Department is muting its support of civilian efforts to learn more about communism and how to fight it.

This happened when the Department acted on a memorandum by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, gagging military leaders from speaking out on communism.

It happened more recently when the Department denied permission for the 11th Naval District band to play at an anti-Communist rally in Santa Monica.

The reason given was that the rally planned to show so-called "controversial movies," including "Communism on the Map," which the Defense Department has banned for use on military bases.

Representative BOB WILSON, Republican, of California, had an apt comment on this when he asked: "Since when is communism controversial?"

This isn't a partisan political matter in which we choose up sides:

There's only one side, and that's the side of Americanism.

The fight is between free, constitutional government and dictatorial, socialistic government. And the attacks are coming from within as well as from outside the United States.

Where does the Defense Department stand? In a letter to Senator CLAIR ENGLE,

Democrat, of California, explaining the Navy Band action at Santa Monica, Arthur Sylvester, public affairs officer of the Defense Department, said:

"It is the firm policy of the Department of Defense . . . to refrain from participation in any public activities which are not directly connected with the mission of the Department and which might give the public the impression that the Department was directly or indirectly sponsoring or endorsing such public indoctrination activities."

Which brings us back to the question: Isn't the Defense Department and its public affairs officer, Arthur Sylvester, in the fight on the side of our free, American institutions and the Constitution of the United States?

If not, who changed the mission? Not the American people.

The Fish Flour Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, a dramatically important new food product known as fish flour is proving itself a lifesaver in underdeveloped areas of the world. Yet, because of an "esthetic" objection, its sale and distribution in this country are prohibited by the Food and Drug Administration. I am hopeful this unfortunate situation will be corrected following a public hearing this fall. Meanwhile, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House the following article by Brad Hathaway in the August 30 issue of the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot Ledger, which tells the fish flour story and describes the process involved in the production of this remarkable protein-rich food:

HIGH-PROTEIN FISH FLOUR FROM NEW BEDFORD PLANT IS NEW FOOD FOR THE WORLD'S POOR

(By Brad Hathaway)

NEW BEDFORD.—The fishing port of New Bedford is playing a big part in a revolutionary development which has achieved remarkable success in some of the underdeveloped areas of the world. The new development: high protein fish flour.

ONLY U.S. PLANT

The only fish flour manufactured in the United States comes from fish meal made in the plant of New Bedford Fish Products Corp.

And the fish flour is keeping hundreds of undernourished children alive in Latin America, Africa, and the Far East.

Strangely enough, the flour cannot be purchased on the retail market in this country.

Its sale and distribution here is prohibited pending approval by the Federal Food and Drug Administration. This agency, so far, has refused to issue its approval on "esthetic grounds." That is because every part of the fish is used in making the meal from which the flour is produced.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the U.S. Department of the Interior has recommended that its sale in this country be approved.

And Congress has appropriated \$50,000 for research in the use of fish protein concentrates (another name for fish flour).

Fish meal is being turned out at the rate of 16 tons a day at the Acushnet River plant of New Bedford Fish Products Corp.

SHIPPED OVERSEAS

The meal is shipped throughout the Nation and to many overseas points as a high protein food supplement for hogs, cattle, poultry, and mink.

Some of the meal is transported to Monticell, Ill., where the parent firm of VioBin Corp. processes it further and turns out 7,500 pounds of fish flour a month for human consumption—overseas.

The man behind it all is Ezra Levin, president of VioBin Corp. He's a man who believes "the sea holds the solution of the future of humanity."

BOON TO FISHING INDUSTRY

The New Bedford plant is the only one in the country which manufactures fish meal by the exclusive VioBin process—a method of low-temperature manufacture in which valuable protein and other nutritional elements in the fish are not destroyed. Operations were first started 4 years ago.

The plant has helped the city's fishing industry considerably. When Food and Drug Administration approval for the sale of fish flour in this country is given, a \$400,000 fish flour manufacturing plant will be built in the old whaling city by VioBin.

Such a plant would utilize 200,000 pounds of industrial fish and fillet plant waste daily in its operations.

Present meal and flour production accounts for a good part of the fishing fleet's industrial fish landings—landings which last year totaled 10,435,000 pounds.

The fish meal manufacturing process at the New Bedford plant begins in the "raw box." There fish frames (fillet house waste) or industrial fish—red hake, whiting, skates, eel pout, sculpins, dogfish, sea robins, monkfish and angler fish—are pitched onto a moving conveyor belt.

From there they move through a vacuum system of pipes, grinders, cookers and desolventizers before emerging as meal and moved on to a storage tank. The meal then goes through a hammer mill for further pulverization and then is stored in hoppers or weighed out into 100-pound bags for shipping out.

Additional processing of the meal at the Illinois plant produces a neutral tasting fish flour.

Mexican studies on the use of VioBin fish flour show that it is the first satisfactory product found in 10 years of work that apparently solves the problem of protein starvation disease.

Studies in El Salvador show the fish flour "is a valuable protein supplement in bread, as a protein extender in school lunches and in foods for restaurants, hospitals, and military establishments."

Controlled studies have proved the fishmeal processed in New Bedford is superior to any fishmeal used previously as a supplement in animal and poultry feeds.

PROTEIN IS PRESERVED

The 4-year operation of the New Bedford plant has established the following facts:

Cost of processing by the VioBin method is no more than conventional processing. All of the protein of the fish is conserved. Practically no oil remains in the meal and no oil remains in the flour.

The meal is stable because it is defatted. It can be stored indefinitely without fear of deterioration.

The meal, being defatted, does not contribute fishy tastes to eggs, pork products, or milk. Conventionally made fishmeals containing oil must be fed in limited quantities because these meals taint eggs, pork products, or milk when fed to animals.

The process used at the New Bedford plant involves temperatures of 100° or lower. This fact insures the conservation of all vitamin values. The meal is never toxic.

Fishmeals now manufactured in other parts of the country varies in biologic quality and cannot be used for human consumption.

With Food and Drug Administration approval for sale of VioBin fish flour in this country, the port of New Bedford can look forward to a much brighter future for its fishing industry—an industry already ranked second in the Nation in the value of its fishery products.

Danger From Within?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the soundest and most constructive editorial voices in North Carolina emanates from television station WRAL-TV, channel 5 in Raleigh. Mr. Jesse Helms, WRAL-TV's vice president of news and public affairs, recently visited Gettysburg and his reflection on that visit, delivered to WRAL-TV viewers on August 23, 1961, are so pertinent to the current challenge confronting our Nation that I believe they should be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress and all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore wish to include this outstanding editorial under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix:

A few weeks ago our family, as typical tourists, stopped at Gettysburg for a visit to the hallowed place where President Lincoln made his most famous address. Such pauses offer the valuable therapy of causing us to be reminded of what we owe to yesterday.

America the Beautiful, as we know it, was purchased by the courage and dedication of men and women who assumed responsibility in days of crisis. And as Dr. Harold Blake Walker wrote a few months ago: "We may wisely profit by (our forefathers') understanding of both the nature and hazards of freedom."

Probably most people who visit Gettysburg return home to brush up on the life of Lincoln. This activity in our household brought to light another great speech by Mr. Lincoln, but one not nearly so well publicized. In January 1837, speaking in Springfield, Ill., Mr. Lincoln warned that America's destruction, if and when it comes, will come from within—not without.

The danger, he said, "if it ever reaches us must spring from amongst us; it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

Mr. Lincoln, of course, knew nothing of missiles or hydrogen bombs or jetplanes. But though he lives in a different age, what he said in 1837 remains true today.

The crisis in our time, as in Lincoln's day, is vastly more internal than external. If we continue to believe that there is, somehow, the miracle of something for nothing, if what we want is extravagant reward for

minimum productivity, then we are asking for the peril that Mr. Lincoln foresaw.

Mr. Lincoln, so very long ago, realized that no nation can bear the burden of its people turning their backs on personal responsibility. To be sure, as Governor Sanford said at Manteo Saturday, we live in a complex society and in a crowded world. But in it, individuals are no less significant than in the days of the pioneers. And their responsibility to do what is right, even at the risk of unpopularity or political defeat, remains the price of freedom.

Much is being said these days about sacrifice. Yet, where is the sacrifice? All around us, intelligent citizens know—in their hearts—that things are wrong in the trends of our community, our State, our Nation. But who speaks up? And why so often do they not?

A paternalistic government is recognizable; socialism is definable. The destination of a society that accepts and embraces them is predictable. Abraham Lincoln predicted it in 1837. But instead of facing up to where we are, and where we are headed, we use words to persuade ourselves that there is no danger when principles are compromised.

Can we deny that we are assuming the role of Dodo, who in "Alice in Wonderland" said pontifically: "Everyone has won, and all must have prizes." We have the appearance of liking everything about socialism except the name. Let a politician lift a plank out of the old-time Socialist Party platform, paint it red, white, and blue, and the voters go on a stampede until they find some public office for him. But in any opinion poll, these same voters are as hostile to the socialist label as they are friendly to its substance.

This, we believe, is what Mr. Lincoln meant in 1837 when he warned of destruction from within. There is no occasion to believe that the people of America would deliberately destroy the very freedoms of which we so often boast. Rather, Mr. Lincoln raised the ultimate question of whether we care most for our comforts, or most for our convictions. Do we believe sufficiently in the truth that set us free to stand up for it?

It is popular, of course, to go along with the crowd. It always is; it always has been. It took courage for history to record the names of Jefferson and Lincoln and Washington and Patrick Henry. They were not always popular with the crowd but if they had chosen other courses there would have been no freedom for us today.

Lincoln was not speaking merely to one generation when he said: "If destruction is our lot, we must ourselves be its author." He was speaking to all generations—including this one.

Hon. Eugene Keogh

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join the many friends of our distinguished colleague, EUGENE KEOGH, in expressing best wishes on this joyful occasion.

Today, marks not only the celebration of Mr. KEOGH's birthday but the observance of his silver anniversary as

a Member of the House of Representatives.

While I knew GENE before coming to Congress in 1953, I did get to know him better during my service in this House.

The gentleman from New York, in my opinion, is a great legislator and a fine public servant who has dedicated a quarter of a century to this great body. His outstanding services to the people of his district in Brooklyn as well as his services to the Nation as a whole have distinguished him as a great American.

We, who have had the honor and privilege to serve with him, admire and respect him as a friend and colleague.

Mr. Speaker, on this happy event, I wish to extend to Congressman KEOGH and his family my best wishes for their continued health and happiness for many, many years to come.

United States Must Not Back Down on Berlin, Ike Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an article by Scripps-Howard Political Writer Charles Lucey, in which former President Eisenhower outlines his views on the Berlin situation and other matters.

I found, as usual, that Mr. Eisenhower speaks in a manner which correctly sums up the prevailing sentiment in this country. Two quotations from the article make this apparent:

The question of negotiating a Berlin settlement with the Russians is immensely difficult—but any time Khrushchev makes you take one backward step, by whatever maneuver, he promptly will try to make you take two.

Also:

The United States must not allow itself to hit the peaks and valley facing the long-haul crisis—our defense programing should be kept in balance and if greater defense outlay is inevitable, there should be an effort to save money on domestic spending.

I found this review of President Eisenhower's opinions and sentiments most interesting. I would commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

UNITED STATES MUST NOT BACK DOWN ON BERLIN, IKE SAYS

(NOTE.—How does it go at Gettysburg these days with America's famed soldier and ex-President, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower? What is Ike's thinking—and how does the man who knew so many crises, in his own two terms, view those now facing his successor? Scripps-Howard's top political writer has been visiting Mr. Eisenhower, and this is the first of two on-the-scene dispatches.)

(By Charles Lucey, Scripps-Howard staff writer)

GETTYSBURG, August 28.—"Suaviter in modo, fortiter in re," runs a Latin legend on Gen. Dwight Eisenhower's desk here. "Gently in manner, strongly in deed"—and it fits the famed soldier's credo today on world crises.

No bluster or bombast flows from the ex-

President in angry reaction to Soviet provocation at Brandenburg gate. The green Pennsylvania hills roll gently away from this little town in shimmering late-August heat and the mood is not for rashness or hysteria. The moment may be tense but the man touched often by crisis contemplates rather the long haul.

Today he believes—

That if we abandon insistence on free access to Berlin, we're on the run.

He cannot stomach—a word he uses with friends—any thought that we can appease Nikita Khrushchev.

The question of negotiating a Berlin settlement with the Russians is immensely difficult—but anytime Khrushchev makes you take one backward step, by whatever maneuver, he promptly will try to make you take two.

THE BIG AIM

Khrushchev plainly is out to get the United States to agree to some type of compromise. We should recognize this isn't going to be a clear-cut thing of stopping the United States by force—to General Eisenhower this is not what seems to be on the Soviet leader's mind. The drive is to get us to recognize the East Germans.

General Eisenhower as President never would stand for it. But the world moves; there is doubt about what kind of support we would get from Europe. It is tough, the soldier tells friends—tough. It will be a hard one, he says.

Yet General Eisenhower tells a visitor Americans should not be downhearted; they have faced many crises. Americans, the people as well as their elected officials, have got to live with a situation. Private Citizen Eisenhower sees little hope of the world situation improving for years—perhaps 40 years, he tells friends.

General Eisenhower paraphrases an old line of Napoleon inveighing against great hysteria in victory and panic in defeat. The United States must not allow itself to hit the peaks and valleys facing the long-haul crisis—our defense programing should be kept in balance and if greater defense outlay is inevitable, there should be an effort to save money on domestic Federal spending.

OLD CAMPAIGNER

Appearing as vigorous and vital as in many years, General Eisenhower follows world affairs with the keen interest of an old campaigner who knows every foot of the terrain, every commander, every possibility of maneuver on either side.

To friends he manifests neither great objection nor great enthusiasm for rushing new troops into Berlin—his feeling seems to be that maybe it was necessary for the moment to strengthen West Berlin morale but it is, after all, mostly show. When he moved troops, he recalls, it was because they were to be needed at a certain point. His belief today is that such a move tells nothing new to Khrushchev that he does not already know. This does not scare him.

General Eisenhower's counsel to Americans is that the Berlin argument not be made strictly on legal or juridical grounds by the West but that it be placed on moral grounds. He asks:

Where is there right or justice in separating families as the Soviets and East Germans are doing by slamming the gates at East Berlin?

What is so wrong or so wicked about East Germans wanting the simple freedom to leave East Germany if they wish?

In conversation with visitors, General Eisenhower refers repeatedly to the need for Americans to be more fully informed on critical situations facing the Nation such as Berlin. He commends the press and radio for trying to do this; to friends he mentions particularly a tragic picture published widely in newspapers and magazines—of an aged East German couple being turned back at the East Berlin gateway by East German troops.

URGES SUPPORT

At Gettysburg today General Eisenhower wishes to be certain he never is cast in the role of second-guessing the man who succeeded him in the White House. Quite the contrary, to visitors he stresses the need of the Nation to support the President fully once the decisions are made.

Yet that he differs with President Kennedy in major respects is unquestioned. His ideas about domestic spending, at a time when heavy increases are demanded in defense outlay, are far more conservative than those of the Kennedy administration.

In private talks, the ex-President voices some mystification at the way Mr. Kennedy seemingly has organized his White House staff, some wonderment at reports the President makes his decisions after a series of meetings with single individuals involved in phases of a problem.

General Eisenhower, as military man and President, favored having all sides of a problem debated out in his presence—before a planning board, a National Security Council meeting or elsewhere, with the President then making the decision on the basis of all he had heard. The boss never abdicates his position, says he, and when the decision is made he directs his staff to follow through on its being put to work throughout the vast Government.

ONE EXAMPLE

An example of how closely he follows the news was made clear to one recent visitor in a comment on Indian Prime Minister Nehru's remarks favorable to the Soviet-East German side of the Berlin question. General Eisenhower observed he always had told Nehru he could understand his wish to be militarily neutral but insisted that where a moral issue was concerned neutrality seemed impossible to him.

Is the ex-President, in moments when recurring crises plague the Nation, detached and apart?

This reporter, after visiting Gettysburg, thinks this emphatically is not so. General Eisenhower believed that after leaving the White House his great feeling would be one of relief. Yet there are times today when almost certainly he regrets that he no longer is in a position where he could put to work, for his country, his experience of so many years. To at least one visitor he has confided that he wishes he might have stayed a little closer in recent months to the matters which had claimed his attention so long.

WOULD SERVE

He has mentioned, in some conversations, the crises that arose when he was President—in the Far East, in Lebanon, in Iran—by way of modest suggestion that perhaps he could have something to advance in the way of approach.

The old soldier today has many projects here in Gettysburg but none so important he could not easily slip away for a mission in which his name, his experience, his world prestige would serve well the Kennedy administration and the Nation. He knows there can be only one President and he and John F. Kennedy would have to agree on the correctness of such a mission. In that circumstance the old soldier would say "Yes."

The Honorable Eugene Keogh

SPEECH OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to the many nice things

said today on the floor about our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. I would like to associate myself with those sentiments, however, to congratulate GENE on his birthday and the silver anniversary of his service in the House, and to wish him many more years of outstanding public service.

I believe that the people of the Ninth District of New York, and our Nation as a whole, are fortunate to have a legislator of his caliber serving in the House of Representatives during this critical period of our history. His understanding of the issues confronting our Nation, his skill as a legislator, and his devotion to the public cause, place him in the front ranks of our great legislators, both past and present.

I have known GENE for many years, and I cherish his friendship and value his counsel. I know that he is admired and respected by Members on both sides of the aisle. I wish him well and I sincerely hope that he will continue to serve in Congress for many years to come.

Constitution Outdated—Fulbright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks and include extraneous matter in the Appendix of the RECORD, I herewith submit the following news article appearing in the San Francisco Examiner of July 29, by Ron Moskowitz, in connection with a speech made by Senator FULBRIGHT which was filmed in Washington and delivered by film before the Cubberley conference on education at Stanford University:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, July 29, 1961]

CONSTITUTION OUTDATED—FULBRIGHT (By Ron Moskowitz)

The Constitution of the United States, designed for an 18th century agrarian society, needs reforming.

And America itself must relinquish some of its jealously guarded sovereignty.

In dropping the two bombshells at Stanford University, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, declared the Kennedy administration's war on our national complacency.

FULBRIGHT said both the constitutional reforms and the relinquishment of sovereignty are necessary if this Nation is to win in its competition with Russia.

He spoke via a color film to nearly 1,000 educators gathered on campus for the Cubberley conference on education. He was scheduled to speak in person, but the press of Washington business prevented that, his office reported.

"The President is hobbled in his task of leading the American people to concerted action," he warned, "by the restrictions of power imposed on him by a constitutional system designed for an 18th century agrarian society far removed from the centers of world power.

BASIC CHANGES

"It is imperative that we break out of the intellectual confines of cherished and traditional beliefs and open our minds to the possibility that basic changes in our system may be essential to meet the requirements of the 20th century.

"Noninvolvement in world affairs today is unthinkable," he said.

"The North Atlantic nations, with their common values as well as common enemies, must surrender far more of their jealously guarded sovereignty than they have already done and press forward with the developments of supranational institutions."

He said this will mean the further development of NATO as an organ of both political and economic cooperation. It will also mean the vigorous implementation and expansion of other existing organizations designed to unite the free nations, he said.

FULBRIGHT said the two major changes are necessary if America is to compete with Russia. He said things move quickly in international affairs and America must be equipped to keep abreast.

Without changes in the outdated Constitution, he said, we will not be able to do so.

"While our basic values may remain essentially unchanged from those which guided the founders of the Republic two centuries ago," he said, "the strategy for defending those values must change with time and circumstances."

He said that public opinion usually lags years behind in its attitudes and assessments of international relations.

HEAR MINORITY

"Public opinion must be educated and led if it is to bolster wise and effective national policies.

"Only the President can provide the guidance that is necessary. Legislators display a distressing tendency to adhere slavishly to the dictates of public opinion, or at least to its vocal and highly organized minority segments.

DIFFICULT TASK

He said both Presidents Wilson and Roosevelt each in times of national crisis, had trouble shaping the national consensus.

"President Kennedy is faced with a far more difficult task," he said. "We are confronted by the most formidable and resourceful adversary ever to have challenged us but the challenge takes subtle and ambiguous focus.

"The President is thus compelled to shape a new kind of consensus, and he is compelled to do without the powerful assistance of cataclysmic events.

"The consensus which President Kennedy must shape should be quite different in character from those which responded to the crises of the past.

MORAL COURAGE

"The American people must be aroused from their bemused preoccupation with trivial self-indulgence. A new kind of consensus is needed: It must be rooted in patience as well as boldness, wisdom as well as resourcefulness, quiet determination as well as righteous dedication, and perhaps most of all, in moral as well as physical courage."

He said that society dedicated to democratic goals is dependent on its education system to cultivate the free mind—free of ignorance and taboos, rigid dogma and blind tradition.

"As a legislator," he said, "I strongly support President Kennedy's program for Federal grants to the States for both school construction and teachers' salaries."

FISCHER SPEAKS

The last speaker of the weeklong meeting, which ended yesterday, was John H. Fischer, renowned dean of Teachers College, Columbia University.

He said the fact that so many American schools are very good should not obscure the fact that so many are equally as bad and need attention.

"But as we reach for new solutions," he said, "we shall have to be careful not to lose what is good in our present situation."

FEDERAL AGENCY

Fischer suggested the creation of a Federal agency concerned with education and responsible to the American people as a whole.

"None of the existing organizations represent the total national interest in education," he said. "We must find ways to correct the local incapacities that cause our worst educational failures while we preserve and enhance the local freedom and initiative that have produced our best schools."

Senator George A. Smathers, of Florida, Receives Veterans of Foreign Wars Gold Medal Americanism Award for 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, well-deserved recognition was given recently to Florida's outstanding U.S. Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS. I take particular pride in calling to the attention of my colleagues that the Veterans of Foreign Wars gave the distinguished and handsome Senator SMATHERS their Americanism Award for 1961.

The VFW is a great organization, long interested in the fostering and development of patriotism, loyalty, and Americanism and in the welfare of the veterans of this country. Therefore, it is particularly significant that the VFW presented their gold medal Americanism Award to Florida's favorite son, the articulate Senator SMATHERS, during their recent convention in my district.

Few men, if any, in this country, have spoken more eloquently or passionately, called more clearly or pointed more forcefully than has Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS to the epochal needs in Latin America, for better understanding between all the Americas and for the exacerbation of communism. The clarion vision of this internationally and domestically astute politician is verified in the facts of today as they exist.

I commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars for their nationally popular selection of Florida's distinguished and favorite son, U.S. Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, to receive the Veterans of Foreign Wars gold medal Americanism Award for 1961.

The Miami Herald, one of the Nation's outstanding newspapers, had this to say about Senator SMATHERS' leadership and the award:

RECOGNIZING LEADERSHIP

For 12 years, Florida's Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS has been acting as a Paul Revere on the subject of Western Hemisphere solidarity.

It was a thankless task until last night when the Veterans of Foreign Wars gave

Senator SMATHERS their Americanism Award for 1961. They chose him for his leadership in alerting the Nation to the need for a better understanding of the rest of the Americas.

That the gold medal was presented here was a gracious conjuncture. Miami is the Senator's hometown. The VFW is holding its 62d convention at Miami Beach this week.

By their presence here, members of the VFW will get an eyewitness view of the consequences of a Communist takeover in Cuba just over the horizon across the Florida Strait. They will see the throngs of Cuban refugees in our community, and hear them speaking their native tongue.

The experience should be revealing to visiting veterans from the other 49 States.

Apart from that, we join in welcoming them to Greater Miami. Their parade tonight and the Pageant of Drums tomorrow in the Orange Bowl will give Miamians a pleasant chance to join in their annual get-together.

The Key to Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, to dramatize the importance of fallout shelters and demonstrate that shelter living is feasible, five volunteers recently subjected themselves to 10 trying days in a darkened shelter on Lovell's Island in Boston Harbor.

I commend to the attention of the House two editorials on this venture. They are entitled "The Key To Survival" and "Meeting the Peril." Both were broadcast by radio station WBZ and WBZ-TV and both contain an important message for us all: America faces a grave threat, but it can be met and perhaps the peril avoided if the people are adequately prepared.

THE KEY TO SURVIVAL

(Delivered by Paul G. O'Friel, general manager, WBZ; James E. Allen, general manager, WBZ-TV)

WBZ has gone all out in the past week to awaken its listening audience to the need for fallout shelters.

The project has centered around Lovell's Island in Boston Harbor. There WBZ Radio News Supervisor Ed Fouhy and four other young men are subjecting themselves to 10 trying days in a darkened shelter. As this dramatic test of shelter living goes into its final stages, we'd like to take a moment to discuss the basic philosophy of this defense program.

We view shelters not only as a means of personal safety, but part of a positive national defense policy. The shelter program is not based on panic; it's based on common sense.

We live in a deeply divided world. We're faced with a cruel and calculating enemy which could launch a nuclear attack upon us.

To stand up to that enemy and the challenges it will continually create around the world, we must be strong, both offensively and defensively. Without this strength, we leave ourselves open to the threat of nuclear blackmail.

Military officials admit there's no effective defense against missiles. The country's future, then, depends on the people's ability to survive an attack. And the shelter program is the one key to survival.

Ultimately the hope of the world lies not in bomb shelters but in disarmament, the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes only. But bringing about arms control is not an easy job; at times the Russians have made it seem almost impossible.

Until some effective way of controlling nuclear warfare is agreed upon, this country must remain strong militarily. That means having weapons for use against the enemy. But it also means having the survival facilities available for the people at home.

You can do your part by getting a shelter ready for yourself and your family.

MEETING THE PERIL

(Delivered by Paul G. O'Friel, general manager, WBZ; James E. Allen, general manager, WBZ-TV)

Operation survival on Lovell's Island is over.

WBZ-Radio News Supervisor Ed Fouhy and four other young men have emerged from the darkened shelter where they spent 10 days. They volunteered for this ordeal to test out the conditions that you and I would have to live under in the event of a nuclear attack. Now here's Ed to share this experience with us.

"Shelter living is certainly no picnic, nor is it as difficult as the five 'Operation Survival' volunteers had anticipated. Our 10-by-20-foot shelter, about the size of the average family living room, was adequate for the five of us. And while our accommodations were not luxurious, they would be easy to endure, had it been a matter of life and death. We learned, through bitter experience, that it is impossible to plan too well a family fallout shelter; and we learned, too, that every person planning his own shelter must provide for his own leisure time needs, as well as his dietary preferences. We did little reading, for example, because the lighting was so poor. With so much leisure, even the men who had never played scrabble or chess learned quickly. The sense of isolation, and the resulting sense of depression, is an enemy perhaps even more dangerous to persons living in a shelter than boredom. This at least was our experience. Our portable radio was a valuable aid in combating this feeling. In short, 'Operation Survival' proved the feasibility of shelter living, but most of all it proved that Americans have a good deal more inner strength than the Kremlin might like to believe."

The prospects of a nuclear war are horrifying, but they must be faced. Should it come, the difference between life and death for many millions of people, the difference between survival and extermination for this country, would be adequate protection from fallout. And that protection can be had only in properly constructed and equipped fallout shelters. The Lovell's Island test has shown that average people can carry on in such quarters.

Admittedly shelter living would be no picnic. But neither was life easy in the trying days in which this country was founded at Plymouth, Lexington, and Valley Forge, in the march across the western frontier. Nor was it easy for those who have fought and died to preserve this country before in wartime.

America again faces a grave threat to its existence. But this peril can be met and perhaps avoided if the people are adequately prepared. You can do your part by getting a shelter ready for yourself and your family. Start preparing for survival today.

Wisconsin Has Pioneered in Social Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we in Wisconsin take particular pride in the fact that our State was the first to enact a constitutional State workmen's compensation law. Wisconsin has always pioneered in the field of social reforms and progressive social legislation. This great heritage is certainly in keeping with our State motto—"Forward."

On August 31 a ceremony was held at the White House to launch the special postal stamp commemorating the 50th anniversary of the enactment of this legislation in Wisconsin. One of the speakers was Peter Schoemann, who is vice president of the AFL-CIO. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include his address in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF PETER T. SCHOEMANN, VICE PRESIDENT, AFL-CIO, AT THE WHITE HOUSE CEREMONIES ON ISSUANCE OF A POSTAL STAMP COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WISCONSIN STATE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAW

Mr. President, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations deeply appreciates this opportunity of participating in the issuance of this beautiful postal stamp commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Wisconsin State workmen's compensation law. That was, of course, a significant action, but it is more meaningful because today every one of the 50 States has followed Wisconsin's example.

In the beginning, workmen's compensation was based on the principle that the workman injured on the job, regardless of fault, should receive a money indemnity to replace approximately two-thirds of his wage loss.

With the passage of 50 years, many States have substantially improved their workmen's compensation programs. The question is whether they have improved them enough. Today, our doctors and those employed in the healing arts can do things for the seriously disabled which were undreamed of 50 years ago.

What the AFL-CIO seeks today, therefore, is a program that would restore each occupationally injured worker to his maximum physical and mental capacity, with whatever retraining is necessary to return him to useful service to society. These goals are not idle dreams. They are practical and attainable.

The AFL-CIO invites your attention, Mr. President, to the fact that State governments have failed to enact the legislation, and to provide the administrative supervision, needed to assure to hundreds of thousands, injured in their employment, the medical care and related assistance needed for rehabilitation and reemployment.

We pledge our support, Mr. President, to your efforts to arouse the American people to see again the vision of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson and those who pioneered with them in developing legislation to protect the injured workman and his family. We will do all we can to see that our State governments attack this problem

with the same boldness and sense of social responsibility that the Governor and Legislature of the State of Wisconsin demonstrated 50 years ago.

A truly great nation will not be indifferent to the families of the thousands of workers who are killed annually on the job, and the millions who are permanently or temporarily disabled.

We sincerely hope this stamp, this ceremony, and your leadership will inspire the States to assure all injured on the job the goals of a modern workmen's compensation system.

Address by Congressman Holifield at Fort Belvoir, Va.

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, one of our best informed colleagues both on atomic energy, its hazards and potentialities, and on civil defense, who is serving as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Chairman of the Military Operations Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, was the speaker at the graduation exercises for shelter program personnel at the U.S. Army Engineer School at Fort Belvoir, Va., on September 1.

Since his subject is of great interest to all of us, I am pleased to insert in the Appendix, his remarks on that occasion, and recommend them for your careful perusal.

Gentlemen, I am honored to be here at the U.S. Army Engineer School and to attend your graduation exercises. You are taking an important first step in the civil defense shelter program as it begins operations under the Department of Defense.

It is good for the future of the program that Army, Navy, and Air Force engineers, civilian and military, have been drawn into this first phase of the training program. Your experience will be useful to you personally; I know it will contribute much to the success of the program.

These are short training weeks. But you have a background in the engineering profession. This is a reorientation course.

I trust that you are ready to proceed with all speed and diligence into the job ahead. As I understand it, you are to begin training the pyramid organization of personnel needed to take the program into all parts of the country. You are to train them well and to train them fast.

We don't have any shelters yet, so accomplishments are still ahead of us. The President, the Congress and the public are interested. After years of talking about shelters, our Government proposes to do something specific about getting them, and you are going to help.

This graduation exercise marks a transition in public and official thinking. I like to put it this way: "America is coming of age in the thermonuclear age." We have a pledge of action, and today is the first downpayment on a program. Some of us have been calling for this kind of action for a long time, and we are very happy to see it begin.

Not all of those who watch with interest will have friendly eyes. I don't need to remind you of that. There is still a wide range of opinion about civil defense among the American people. And even those of us

who recognize the dimensions and the difficulties of the problem, will keep on debating the merits of particular plans and activities.

As far as our committees are concerned—I refer here to the Military Operations Subcommittee and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee—we will maintain a friendly but critical regard for your efforts. We will do so because we work for a better and better program. The knowledge you gain here will help the Congress and it will help the country to understand what is needed in the future.

The first mistakes or misdirected efforts will beget you criticism from all sides; you might as well be prepared for that. Don't let that knowledge make you overcautious or dismayed. You must simply be professionally concerned and conscientious.

There are many people who will look on this survey and marking program as a necessary first step, but not much more. This may be disheartening, perhaps, to some of you who are engaged in a large and demanding job. But everyone will be interested in the final results, and in their accuracy and significance for many parts of this great country, and for the Nation as a whole.

I look upon your immediate job as undertaking a technical building census for survival. I say "technical" because this will be a professional job, not a mere counting procedure. It is not glamorous, but it is important for national survival.

As Department of Defense personnel, no doubt you are accustomed to being satisfied with a well-done message from your superiors who know your problems. We want to assure you that those of us who understand the need, and the importance of your work, will be very gratified to see the completion of the urgent mission entrusted to you.

Let me talk about efficiency for a minute. I hope your training here does not suggest a too-rigid approach to what is new, and what is perhaps a one-time problem. I hope that each of you will be ready and able to jump on every new idea and shortcut that may be suggested—either by yourselves, the persons you train, or others who have competence and knowledge. Undoubtedly you will find great regional and special problems that must be tackled with individual initiative and effort.

If this job can be done in less time, or for less money, the country will have great cause to thank those who make it possible. The benefits may be far more important than the specific savings. I charge you all with the responsibility of seeking shortcuts which will hasten the work without impairing its value.

The time is late. Programs along this line should have been started some years ago. Fallout was known to the scientists and weapon specialists from the time the first bombs went off. They knew a lot more about it in 1953-54, when the winds shifted in the Bikini Atoll and showed the dimensions of the fallout hazard.

So, I congratulate you, and commend you on your new assignments, and convey to you without their knowledge the thanks of millions of Americans who will be given the chance of survival in the event of a nuclear war.

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

**SPEECH
OF**

HON. FERNAND J. ST. GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to rise in tribute

to my colleague from New York on the occasion of his birthday and the silver anniversary of his service in the Congress. As a freshman Member of this august assembly, I have been encouraged by and profited from the words and actions of GENE KEOGH. His dedicated service to our country as a Member of this body has brought dignity and honor to the Congress as well as to himself.

As the best dressed man in the Congress GENE KEOGH brings a propriety and decorum to this Chamber which few can match. His diligent efforts in behalf of his constituents and his Nation are reflected in his work on various committees of the House. His reputation as an effective and able Member of the Congress has preceded this tribute we offer today.

I join my colleagues in paying due respects to a gentleman who has done much to serve his Nation and one whom I know will continue to serve with honor and distinction.

Support for Truth in Lending by One Who Extends Credit

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post, September 5, 1961. It is heartening to see Robert Hall Clothes, Inc., an institution which extends credit, endorsing the principles of H.R. 6725—a bill which I introduced on May 1, 1961, which would require the disclosure of finance charges in connection with the extension of credit.

The advertisement follows:

**WHY DOES A FAMILY CLOTHING CHAIN
BECOME A BOOK REVIEWER?**

Our stores are rooted in 345 American communities throughout the Nation. It is an honor we cannot treat lightly. No merchant could. With it comes a responsibility to serve each community honestly and well.

For this reason we depart from our daily task as merchants to call your attention to a forthright and extraordinary book. Called "Buy Now, Pay Later," it was written by a perceptive and painstaking reporter, Mr. Hillel Black, and published by William Morrow & Co. In very human terms, it deals with the effect runaway consumer credit has upon our lives and our futures.

Mr. Black started this book after covering the story of a 19-year-old boy's innocent dream to see if he could really "live it up" on a credit card binge. It was Mr. Black's first introduction to the startling, oftentimes tragic, effects of debt living in today's modern-minded, luxury-loving era. The book came as a natural development, an essential, driving examination. Carefully documented, fervent and provocative, it tells of the strains and tragedies imposed on people who are trying to keep up with the bill collector. It tells of the moral abandon many families indulge in because of easy credit. It tells of the lack of knowledge most people have about what they really pay for the privilege of buying on credit.

We believe, as Mr. Black does, that credit, without adequate information, self-discipline, and good judgment can get out of hand.

We urge consumers everywhere to familiarize themselves with the truths as presented in "Buy Now, Pay Later."

Last year 100,000 families went into bankruptcy. This is an alarming increase over the past decade and more than the total number of bankruptcies filed during the depths of the depression of the 1930's. How could this happen during an era of our greatest abundance?

On-the-cuff-living easy payment plans are being booked 24 hours a day. Purchases are being made not with cash on hand but with future earnings. It is becoming easier and easier to go into debt. If for any reason families who have assumed excessive credit cannot meet their payments, they are faced with the tragedy of bankruptcy.

We believe, as Mr. Black believes, that consumers once again must become hard traders, comparing values, demanding accurate information and taking on responsibilities that they can realistically handle. And they must buy what they are sure fits their actual budgets.

Consider this: In most instances the consumer, because it all looks so easy, is completely uninformed on what he actually pays for the privilege of running a buy now, pay later debt.

What does "small service charge" really cost? The price for consumer credit is frequently astounding, reports Mr. Black. One civic group gave these examples: a store sells a product for \$329.95 on a 24-month contract with a \$10 downpayment. Mr. Consumer pays the store \$66 extra for credit—enough to buy 285 quarts of milk.

Or, assume, Mr. Consumer wants to buy a big luxury item for \$2,660.52 with a \$460.52 downpayment. Credit charges on the \$2,200 balance on a 36-month contract can cost him over \$400. Think of it. A charge enough to purchase a washing machine and a dryer.

Are we turning into a nation of consumer automatons? We buy without asking the cost and pay without adequate information.

Isn't it about time consumers started asking questions about credit? Living in a fool's paradise of carefree buy now, pay later habits will not serve to strengthen our free enterprise economy.

We join hands with Mr. Hillel Black in his plea for a return to the tried and true American traditions of respect for thrift and restraint in mortgaging our future.

ROBERT HALL CLOTHES, INC.

Tribute to Representative Keogh on His Birthday

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTAIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with his many friends and colleagues in extending to my fellow New Yorker, EUGENE J. KEOGH, my good wishes on the occasion of his birthday and his 25th anniversary as a Member of the House of Representatives.

I had the pleasure of serving with GENE KEOGH in the New York State Legislature from which we were graduated to membership in the House of Repre-

sentatives. As an alumnus of that body and as a member of the House I had occasion to observe him; and I do not hesitate to say that I consider him one of our most competent legislators and, I might say, skillful diplomats.

Many have been the encomiums uttered on this occasion and there is little I can say in addition. I wish only to add a personal prayer that he will continue his devoted and valuable service to our country for many years to come.

Special Stamp Conveys Tribute to Wisconsin Workmen's Compensation Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on August 31, it was my privilege to attend the White House ceremony that introduced the commemorative stamp honoring the 50th anniversary of the enactment of Wisconsin's Workmen's Compensation Act. During the ceremony, Postmaster General J. Edward Day gave an inspiring speech, which I would like to include in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks:

REMARKS OF POSTMASTER GENERAL J. EDWARD DAY AT CEREMONIES INTRODUCING THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAW COMMEMORATIVE STAMP, THE WHITE HOUSE, THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 1961

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the Post Office Department is highly honored that this ceremony is being held at the White House, with the President and so many significant leaders of government and of the labor movement participating.

Fifty years ago tomorrow, the Nation's first constitutional State workmen's compensation law became effective.

Enacted by the Wisconsin State Legislature in early 1911, and signed into law by that State's Governor, this statute became the forerunner of legislation now in effect in each of the 50 States of the union.

Because of the humanitarian convictions of that generation of State legislators, millions of American families are insured today against those unfortunate and unforeseeable circumstances which might, through injury or death, remove their breadwinners from the payrolls of American industry.

The passage of workmen's compensation laws represented the starting point for a series of major enactments, State and Federal, which over these 50 years have given increasing recognition to the dignity of the working man.

It is a privilege, Mr. President, that through your auspices this commemoration takes the form of a U.S. stamp, which will convey our tribute to the four corners of the world.

Because it is our policy to honor only a very few highly significant people or subjects each year through our commemorative stamp program, this occasion has increased importance.

The stamp which we are unveiling here today will first be placed on sale at Milwaukee, Wis., on Labor Day—September 4.

One hundred million of the stamps will be printed. They will be on sale in every one of

our 35,000 post offices from Point Barrow to Key West and from Maine to Pago Pago.

The design of the new workmen's compensation law stamp is essentially abstract, seeking to communicate the ideal of law—perfect justice.

Printed in blue and gray, it features the scales of justice and equality, with a workman and his family balancing a representation of industry.

We can assume that this stamp will find a place in the albums of many of the millions of stamp collectors of all ages and in all parts of the world as a permanent reminder of a great milestone in social progress.

Inland and Burns Ditch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my statement before the Army Engineers' hearing on the Burns Ditch proposed project when the hearing session was held at Indianapolis on August 30th.

The following is an editorial by James S. DeLaurier, editor and publisher of the Hammond Times, setting out facts submitted by the Inland Steel Co., of East Chicago, Ind., as testimony at last week's Army Engineers' hearing:

INLAND AND BURNS DITCH

One of the more significant voices opposing a Port of Indiana at the Burns Ditch area of Porter County was unheard—although on the record—at the U.S. Army Engineers' port hearing in Indianapolis last week.

It was that of Inland Steel Co., the eighth largest steel producer in the United States and operator, at its Indiana Harbor Works, of the third largest steel mill in the Nation. Inland is against locating a Port of Indiana at the Burns Ditch site.

Why it opposes the site in Porter County was set forth in a written statement submitted on behalf of the company for the hearing record by Hjalmar W. Johnson, vice president for research and planning. It was placed in the record although not read at the hearing.

To begin, Johnson makes clear that Inland Steel has a valid interest in the Porter County area, where it is proposed to locate the port. Since 1919 Inland has owned more than 800 acres of land, including the mile of shoreline from the Lake-Porter County line eastward to Ogden Dunes.

"This property has been held and continues to be held for the purpose of building a steel plant with harbor connections," Johnson points out. Actually, maps locating the proposed port's future extension to the southwest show the harbor line touching the southeast corner of the Inland Steel property south of U.S. 12.

Inland's statement declares that the October 1960, interim report submitted by the Army Engineers estimates that overseas general cargo would amount to only 165,000 tons a year by the 10th year after the proposed Burns Ditch port is completed, and only 370,000 tons a year by the end of a 50-year period.

In contrast, the annual waterborne tonnage for steel mills proposed to be built at the site would run to 10 million tons per year.

This, Inland says, would mean that State and Federal Governments together would be investing \$74 million "mainly for the benefit of two private steel companies."

But even this tonnage, Inland says will be "negligible" until coke ovens, blast furnaces, and steel furnaces are installed. Inland says that day appears to be some distance away.

Inland Steel takes note that Hammond, Whiting, and East Chicago have urged Congressman RAY J. MADDEN to petition the Army Engineers (MADDEN has done so) for a study of what has come to be known as the "Tri-City Port" which would extend along the shores of the three cities and would be created by building a long breakwater between existing breakwaters at South Chicago and Indiana Harbor.

Furthermore, Inland points out, the Monon Railroad is going ahead with plans to improve the harbor at Michigan City at its own expense, which would provide a port for handling bulk and general cargoes.

Inland asks the Army Engineers to disapprove the Burns Ditch site until a study can be made of the proposed "Tri-City Harbor" in Lake County.

So far as is known, this is the first time that Inland or any other of the major steel companies in Lake County has taken a position on the most recent proposals for building a Port of Indiana at Burns Ditch. There is some feeling that Lake County steel mills have refrained from speaking out on the Burns Ditch site question in the past for fear it might seem they were taking a "dog in the manger" attitude.

Now that Inland views have been officially placed on the record, it is apparent that the Lake County mayors and the Hammond and East Chicago Chambers of Commerce have gained powerful supporting voice in their drive to build a Port of Indiana in the "Tri-City" location.

The West's Voice of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column by Mr. Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on September 3, 1961.

The column follows:

THE WEST'S VOICE OF FREEDOM
(By Roscoe Drummond)

BERLIN.—President Kennedy has said there are three Western rights in West Berlin which are not negotiable: The right of its people to a government of their own choosing, the right of Western access, and the presence of Western troops to prove that we will defend these rights.

I would like to add a fourth.

The fourth Western right which we ought not to yield nor negotiate away is the Western Voice of Freedom in Berlin, which has the largest audience of any radio station in all Eastern Germany, which symbolizes the very heart of what we stand for—freedom of thought—and which the Soviets yearn to snuff out.

I refer to RIAS (radio in the American sector), which is the only radio station with a signal strong enough to be heard widely throughout East Germany and whose reporting is so trusted as the nearly lone

source of truth about what is going on in the world.

Let's be clear about this. The only way Western rights in West Berlin can be secured is to show that we have the will and the means to defend those rights—by force if necessary. These rights will not be any more secure by giving away the freedom and the facility to report the truth.

Recently East Berlin newspapers and radio commentators have pounced on President Kennedy's reference to "any actual irritants in West Berlin" which the United States would be ready to remove. They have suggested that "above all" they would like to rid themselves of RIAS. Of course they would. But there is no evidence whatsoever that the core of Western rights to West Berlin would be more secure if RIAS were liquidated.

RIAS is an irritant to the Soviets and East German Communists only because any freedom of speech, any freedom of the press, is an irritant. But just because the Soviets would like us to throttle the Western voice of freedom in West Berlin is no reason we should do so.

The denial of freedom of speech and freedom of the press in East Germany is an irritant to us, but I fear no suggestion from Mr. Khrushchev or Herr Ulbricht that they would put its removal on the agenda of negotiation with the West.

Let us not throw away RIAS for nothing. In fact, let's not throw away RIAS for anything. I doubt that President Kennedy intends to do so. Let us not be tempted into the mistake of believing that abandoning RIAS would reduce by one iota the Soviet threat to Western rights in West Berlin.

The very violence of the East German attack on RIAS is evidence of its effectiveness. During the week I have been in Berlin, RIAS has been the continued target of Communist vituperation, which describes it as the "swamp flower of the U.S. Government" and accuses it of being "inducers of youths to become incendiaries" and "director of the NATO spies."

I have examined the RIAS programs in detail and they contain no appeal to the East Germans to revolt, no call to arms. They are provocative if factful reporting of the news and calm expression of Western views are provocative. They are provocative only if it is provocative to report to the East Germans news and views they cannot get elsewhere.

Now that the border has been sealed by Khrushchev, the work of RIAS is more necessary and more wanted by the East Germans than before. It is a revealing fact that RIAS is receiving more letters from East German listeners now than before travel to West Berlin was banned.

No German radio station has the kilowatt strength under the Amsterdam Treaty to reach East Germany effectively. RIAS is needed as the Western voice of freedom. We ought not to let Khrushchev talk us or threaten us out of it.

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in saluting our beloved colleague, the Honorable EUGENE KEOGH, upon this notable occasion. As he observes his birthday and his silver anni-

versary as a Member of the House of Representatives, GENE should take pride and satisfaction in the brilliant record he has carved for himself through the years. His constituents and his fellow countrymen everywhere are indebted to him for his dedicated legislative service. His fine qualities of mind and heart have won GENE the admiration and affection of all his colleagues who rejoice with him on this significant milestone in his life. I extend to GENE my warm felicitations and my very best wishes for many, many more years of success and happiness.

Immediate Service or Letter in Quadruplicate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that is obviously growing in intensity is the question of public against private power. The Members of Congress are thoroughly familiar with the issue and it is not my purpose to discuss it in detail.

However, Mr. Speaker, a weekly community newspaper in my district, the Worth Record, in its edition of Thursday, August 24, contained an editorial entitled "Immediate Service or Letter in Quadruplicate." This editorial comment is a thought-provoking and penetrating observation on public versus private power, and I am sure will be appreciated by those who may note it in the RECORD. I, under unanimous consent, insert it in the RECORD:

IMMEDIATE SERVICE OR LETTER IN QUADRUPPLICATE

"For government to compete with its citizens in areas where private business is imminently capable and willing to do the job is wrong in principle and is counter to our American system of economic free enterprise."

That is the view of the Ogden, Utah, Standard-Examiner. And it cites a clear-cut case of proposed and totally needless socialism.

The proposal, now before Congress, would authorize a \$176 million Federal electric transmission system to carry power from the Colorado River storage project. The system would cover Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona.

It is needless because investor-owned utilities in these States have offered to carry the power over their lines, at moderate cost. The Standard-Examiner sums up a number of specific benefits that would follow. For one thing, the taxpayers would be saved the huge building costs. For another, the utilities would pay \$3,280,000 in taxes, including \$1,160,000 which would go to schools, whereas the Federal system would pay none.

The newspaper observes that the congressional battle over this matter may be involved and abstract. However, it adds, that it can be reduced to one simple question in operating terms: "... when we private citizens experience a sudden power failure in our homes would we prefer to immediately

phone the local electric utility company, or would we prefer to mail a letter in quadruplicate, to a faceless Washington bureaucracy?

Nixon Hole in One Not an Ace, Just Par for the Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, former Vice President Nixon is reported to have scored his first hole in one at Bel Air, Calif., this Labor Day weekend. I submit that the report is possibly in error on two counts:

First. This is not the first day that Mr. Nixon has executed a bold stroke at the expense of labor.

Second. He did not reach this hole with one blow. I would recount two other whiffs or mulligans or shanks which he indulged this week before he rose to the tee for a sporting shot at Bel Air. He made the first pass when he took a fast backswing and scored a clean miss. I refer to the report which I heard over a nationwide radio network this morning stating that the erstwhile presidential candidate saw fit to chide the members of the Washington press on their White House coverage because they did not know, according to Mr. Nixon, that the wife of our President, Mrs. John F. Kennedy, was pregnant. As usual, Mr. Nixon would appear to be presently untimely, characteristically incorrect, and unbecomingly improper.

I too much respect the offices of Representative, Senator, and the Vice Presidency to suggest that one who has held all three might not have the stature necessary to stand more than eye level with a bedroom keyhole. However, I urge that in this instance Mr. Nixon seek out a more reliable 19th hole, if not a more manly locker room. I am sure that Mr. Nixon will agree that his wife, mine, and Mrs. John F. Kennedy must remain inviolate from the low-level pitch from the trap which scatters sand and fails to move the ball, politically or otherwise.

On his second shot, Mr. Nixon's approach from the rough terrain of sour grapevines was no more accurate. Evidently reminiscent of the three-putt, repeat putt, putt, putt, results of our foreign policy of the past 8 years he tried to shave a stroke and attempted to use a wedge to pitch into a situation which he did little to solve in those 8 years. His criticism of the Berlin situation with respect to the use of the 1,500-troop task force directed by President Kennedy is just so much yapping at the dogleg, out of bounds, and wide of the pin.

As a military man who once stood within 110 kilometers of Berlin in our Armed Forces I would remind the former Vice President that reinforcements always strengthen, never weaken, and are much respected by the enemy. In

fact even one American going in the right direction at this time should give pause to the thinking of the communist dictator.

I submit the editorial from today's New York Journal American from the same edition which carried the report of Mr. Nixon's hole in one:

NIXON'S CRITIQUE

Our readers may recall that in the Presidential campaign last year we supported Vice President Nixon because we thought he was more experienced in foreign affairs, particularly in combination with Henry Cabot Lodge.

However, that does not preclude observing that in his recent criticism of President Kennedy, regarding the strengthening of our garrison in Berlin, Mr. Nixon seemed to be speaking more from personal politics than international sagacity. He called the addition of 1,500 more troops "an empty gesture."

As the victor in the 1960 contest pointed out at his press conference last week, the purpose in sending in the troops was not to make Berlin impregnable, since from the military point of view it is untenable.

The purpose was (a) to emphasize to the Russians that we mean to defend our position there and (b) to remind Berliners that we are standing by our commitment to them.

"I don't see really how that weakens our commitment," said the President. "If troops were withdrawn, would that strengthen it?"

It was a pretty good tag line. Anyway, perhaps Mr. Nixon might better occupy himself by deciding whether he's going to run for Governor of California.

In conclusion no, Mr. Nixon, your latest was a decent shot but the last two were slices or hooks from bad lies or worse. I respectfully suggest that you stand up to the ball, take a firm grip, a slow backswing and follow through. If you do all these you will understand the game that our President is playing. As far as I am concerned, for the past eight months, President John F. Kennedy has been shooting for eagles all the way. These are the eagles of course with the olive branches in one claw and the arrows in the other. You may look good on the par threes but for the long ones the big hitter, President John F. Kennedy is doing a grand job without hitting too far down or taking too much divot in the process.

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do certainly not want to miss the opportunity to join with so many of my colleagues today in paying tribute to my good friend, the gentleman from New York, EUGENE J. KEOGH, who is observing the anniversary of his 25 years of service in the House of Representatives, and who is also celebrating his birthday.

Having been so closely associated with the gentleman from New York—we are in the same delegation—I have had ample

occasion to observe his dedication to duty and his outstanding record as a public servant over the years. He enjoys the respect and admiration of all those with whom he serves, and rightly so.

Many times I have benefited by his wise counsel and advice, and so I take double pleasure in extending my best wishes for his birthday, and my congratulations on his silver anniversary in Congress.

City of Pensacola, Fla., Concerned About Efforts To Muzzle Military Personnel's Comments Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 21, 1961

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in my State of Florida, the city of Pensacola has been very concerned with efforts to muzzle military personnel who have had the courage to speak out against communism and for Americanism. For instance, the Greater Pensacola Chamber of Commerce has called upon area citizens to urge an investigation of the Fulbright memorandum. I quote from the Pensacola Journal of Sunday, August 27:

Patently alarmed by statements made by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas in the controversial memorandum made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD August 3, W. M. Swinford, chamber president, had this to say:

"If we are to safeguard the constitutional right of every man to speak—in uniform or out—this memorandum and its intent must be fully investigated."

"Senator RICHARD RUSSELL's Military Affairs Committee will complete this investigation, and, we feel sure, take appropriate action if enough citizens urge them to do so."

"FULBRIGHT's memorandum, in which he deplored so-called right wing radicalism," also urged restriction on public utterances by military leaders on foreign affairs.

"FULBRIGHT also singled out such organization as Pensacola's Project Alert, apparently as examples of rightwing radicalism."

"Primary Mr. FULBRIGHT's remarks are statements proposing that members of the Armed Forces not exercise their constitutional right of free expression to speak, either to comrades in arms or the general public on topics which relate to foreign affairs, topics on which many of the military are extremely well informed."

"Mr. FULBRIGHT requested the Defense Department to silence military men, threatening their careers if they fail to comply."

"In the same vein, the Senator has attempted to cast doubt upon groups of civilians who have sought through patriotic efforts to tell the true story of the Communist menace before their fellows."

"Our own project alert has been criticized in this vein."

"In short," Swinford concluded, "the Senator has said that 'the American people don't need to know about foreign policy or affairs.'"

Swinford asked that all citizens of Pensacola write to Senator RUSSELL immediately urging that his committee complete the investigation.

He said they must act at once, since the congressional session will be over in 2 weeks.

Action by the chamber was the latest in a series of criticisms of the Fulbright memorandum since excerpts from it were published on July 20. Originally it had been sent to the Secretary of Defense.

Among others who criticized the memorandum were Congressman BOB SIKES, of Florida, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, who called it "one of the most shocking documents I have read since coming to Washington."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, credited the Fulbright memorandum with the issuance of a Defense Department directive which BRIDGES contends has the effect of "muzzling" members of the armed services.

He called for the investigation by the Military Affairs Committee.

I submit, also, Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the Pensacola News, of Tuesday, August 29, which deals further with this important subject:

FRONTIERSMEN WOULD BANISH TEACHING OF CONSERVATISM

One of the greatest shocks this Nation has ever undergone came at the close of the Korean war when Americans learned of the number of U.S. soldier-prisoners who preferred to defect and follow the Red line.

Certainly this deserved concentrated study to determine just why any American who had lived under this Nation's freedoms and opportunities would voluntarily choose another ideology. The study which followed revealed that many of our troops and many more millions of civilians had no real basic knowledge of the principles of Americanism, and how these benefit them. It therefore seemed obvious to any intelligent, loyal American that we have been sadly remiss in teaching the ideals, principles, and advantages of our form of Government.

Because of this there have been many different organizations created in recent years with this objective and basic aim—to inculcate in American minds the true principles of freedom, personal independence, and the American way of life which is a basic guarantee of the continuation of the liberties which we find so dear.

There have been many variations among these organizations, just as there are differences in the thinking of Americans on all facets of life. That is a part of the American tradition, for without the differences, and the freedom of independent thought which creates such differences, America could never have reached the heights which it has attained.

Among these are those who advocate more and more governmental activity to protect the individual, to assure him of a better way of life, to care for him when he is incapable of providing for himself.

There are others who sincerely believe this trend has gone much too far in recent years, that our policies have threatened the individual liberties of our citizens, have made them dependent on governmental handouts, have destroyed their personal initiative. The latter have become convinced that if such trends are not curtailed, even reversed, this Nation ultimately will plunge headlong into complete socialism which can only end in the ultimate loss of all liberty.

They point out that socialism in such a form is different from communism only in name—that Communists of Russia consider themselves Socialists.

Among the latter organizations is Project Alert of the Greater Pensacola area. Created and directed by leaders of civilian life in the community, it has paralleled in some respects the moral leadership program instituted by military leaders to improve the ethical stand-

ards of service personnel and install a greater loyalty to this Nation and what it stands for. Since the objectives of the two movements are quite similar, some military leaders have become identified with the civilian program.

The success of both efforts has been outstanding.

But the gains attained do not conform to the ideas of some New Frontiersmen of Washington. The latter consider it a radical rightwing approach which does not represent their ideas of what is best for and about America.

These do not have the same fears about the possible dangers of even more radical leftwing thinking.

Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, one of the most staunch defenders of liberal trends, has protested to President Kennedy and Defense Secretary McNamara concerning the spoken position of some military leaders who consider the conservative attitude is best. Senator FULBRIGHT outlined his position in a lengthy statement which has become known as the Fulbright memorandum. Because of it the White House has issued orders which in effect have gagged our military personnel.

This gagging has become a red hot issue in the Pensacola area because the memorandum cites Project Alert as one of the programs which should be out of bounds because of alleged political overtones.

That leaves us wondering if there would be similar concern about politics if the emphasis had been toward the far left.

Maybe, to be on the safe side, the Project Alerters should follow the Chicago Tribune's tongue-in-cheek advice and refer to Red Chinese as agrarian farmers, join the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and become local distributor for the Worker.

If this gag on free speech and free thought is continued our basic right to liberty will be lost without a shot fired.

Foreign Assistance Act of 1961

**SPEECH
OF**

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted for all Members to extend their remarks in the RECORD during the debate on the conference report on the mutual security bill, I would like to make a statement regarding this legislation.

I have always supported our foreign aid program in the past and I will support this conference report today because it is apparently the best compromise the conferees could obtain.

However, I am greatly disappointed to note that the statement of policy in the bill has been watered down to the point where it has little meaning. The language in the House bill offered greater protection to American citizens and American business regarding their rights against boycotts and blockades, and I feel that this language should have been retained by the conferees. The House Foreign Affairs Committee and the House itself voted in favor of the stronger language and I am sorry the Senate conferees insisted on weakening it. I do not see how we can possibly improve our own position by offering less protection to our own citizens and businessmen.

The removal of that portion of our statement of policy which granted the right of commercial access to other countries makes it appear that the United States condones the actions of some countries in boycotting American trade. If we are to continue to give aid to other countries, I do not think it is too much to expect them to trade with American business, without discrimination.

By watering down our statement of policy, we are opening the door for those nations guilty of discrimination against our citizens to charge that Congress does not care if they pursue their blackmail, blockades and discrimination of American business. The statement of policy originally passed by the House let the world know that the United States objects to such actions, especially by nations we are helping through our mutual security program.

Because I realize the good accomplished by our aid to other countries, I will support this conference report, but I want to go on record as protesting the wording in our statement of policy because I feel that the language indicates that our Government is not prepared to protect the essential rights and liberties of its citizens. "Trade—Not Aid" is an excellent motto and I feel very strongly that America has the right to trade with any other nation in the world, regardless of the internal disputes of one nation with another.

A Small Voice in a Noisy World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my news report of August 25, 1961:

A SMALL VOICE IN A NOISY WORLD

The other day the House of Representatives opened its session exactly as it did the first time on March 4, 1789, in New York City. The Speaker rapped for order and asked the Chaplain to pray.

As Members of the House, the many clerks and hundreds of visitors in the galleries bowed their heads, a rich baritone flowed to every nook of the big chamber. Quoting from Daniel 11: 32, the voice intoned: "The people that know God shall be strong and do exploits."

It was the voice of the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D.D., the House Chaplain. As he prayed, I was struck again by the thought of how much good one dedicated man can accomplish. Among scores of strong personalities, who really are world famous, Dr. Braskamp is a humble, retiring minister.

He is completing his 12th year as Chaplain. Most of the clergymen before him held pastorates in active churches as well as the duties of House Chaplain. So did Dr. Braskamp. He came here from Princeton Seminary in 1911 and was on the staff of the National Presbyterian Church, now known as "Tke's Church." In 1952, he resigned his pastorate of Gunton-Temple Church, because his Capitol Hill duties were requiring most of his time. He is the first House Chaplain

to devote full time to Members of Congress, their staffs, and their families.

Dr. Braskamp has one of the biggest parishes in Washington. He not only opens the sessions with prayer every day, but is available day and night to anyone who wants his services. He performs baptisms, weddings, funerals, visits the sick and dying in their homes and hospitals, and is a tower of strength and comfort for hundreds who seek his counsel. He estimates that he has over 3,000 persons in his pastoral care.

The youngest and newest file clerk in a Capitol Hill office or the chairman of some powerful congressional committee get equal time, attention, and help from Dr. Braskamp. The demands on him for counseling and other services are growing constantly. He rejoices in this, for he sees it as a general trend toward religion in troubled times. His reward is to see people gain inner peace and strength.

It is no exaggeration that what Members of Congress do today affects not only Americans, but humanity itself.

We are bedeviled on every side by harsh, cruel enemies, who scorn the ethics and mandates of any religion and openly jeer at even the rules of decency. In dealing with them, it would be the human tendency to match them in injustice and hatred. But day after day, the calm voice rolls over the House and with fervor reminds the lawmakers of the things that are God's and of His justice.

Nobody could calculate what influence for good Dr. Braskamp has on our world today. But it can be appreciated and many thousands do.

Combating Communism Effectively

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently the Lutheran Witness published the third of a series of four articles on how we can effectively combat communism written by the Reverend Lambert Brose. In this extremely informative treatise, Reverend Brose emphasizes that there are three questions each must answer to separate the men from the boys on how serious we are about fighting communism.

Because these questions and the answers are important to us in understanding what our program of action should be in the cold war, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMBATING COMMUNISM EFFECTIVELY—III:
PROGRAM OF ACTION—THE COST
(Third in a series of articles by
Lambert Brose)

In 13 seconds you may decide to stop reading.

Because now we come to the bitter test that separates the men from the boys: those who just want to shout about the evils of communism and those who are willing to repeat an expression used earlier—to "put their money where their mouth is."

Give yourself a quick yes or no test on these three questions:

1. If a Negro family moved in next door, would you move out as fast as you could sell your house?

2. If you were asked to give another \$100 a year to help people in the underdeveloped nations, would you "yell your head off"?

3. If someone said that what you yourself are doing to "preach the Gospel to every creature" ought to be written up in the comic books, would you dismiss it with a shrug of the shoulder?

HAVE WE THE COURAGE?

The way we answer these questions—at least our general attitude toward them—will show, to a considerable degree, whether we really want to go all-out in the fight against communism.

I don't think most of us have the courage to do it. Not yet.

But I also think that if we see the desperate need and—above all—faithfully continue to study God's Word, the Holy Spirit will give us the courage.

In the fourth and final article of this series specific steps the individual Christian can take to combat this godless ideology will be proposed. Included will be a discussion of Communist infiltration in our own homeland and what we can do to stop it.

The present article points up what such a program of action will cost. Perhaps in changes in our thinking. Surely in time, effort, and money.

DARK EYES WATCHING

Next to the population explosion and hunger—race relations is perhaps the biggest issue of our time.

Look at the facts. The white race is a minority on this globe. There are more than twice as many colored people as whites.

All over the world—from the Congo to the Ganges to the Yalu to the Nile—searching eyes are upon us. Upon us and the Communists. Billions of dark eyes watch intently to see how each world power treats the question of race.

And the United States enters this decisive struggle with two strikes against it. For us it's a question of coming from behind if we are to win.

WHAT'S HAPPENING IN NEW YORK?

Recently NBC News reported that the only possible reason United Nations headquarters might be relocated (perhaps in Vienna, as Khrushchev has suggested) would be that the now numerous African delegates might vote for such a move. Because of the racial discrimination practiced against them in New York.

Not in Atlanta or Montgomery or Little Rock. But in New York City. Just across the harbor from the Statue of Liberty.

JAMES FACKLER STORY

It's old stuff to recite the following. But it's frighteningly true. Every time Negroes are jeered and taunted (as were 80 hotel fire victims on June 26 while being temporarily sheltered in Missouri Synod Holy Cross Lutheran Church, Chicago); every time a preacher to the Negroes is flogged in Alabama (as happened March 16 when Missouri Synod Vicar James Fackler was beaten up by segregationists); every time a diplomat from one of the African countries is refused service in a U.S. restaurant (March 9 near Hagerstown, Md.), these unfortunate events are blazoned across the vast nonwhite world by radio, TV, newspapers, and word of mouth.

And the people in Asia and Africa and Latin America don't care whether the Communists exploit these incidents for propaganda purposes. All they know is that in Chicago—and Maryland—and Alabama—once more a black man has been treated like a slave. Or a white man sympathetic to the Negro has been beaten up. All this in the

country supposedly leading the fight for freedom.

DELICATE MATTER

Race relations is a most delicate and difficult matter. People have honest differences of opinion—in both the South and the North—as to how we should handle it.

All I'm saying is that we'd better find a solution—and fast—if we want to combat communism effectively.

AFLAME WITH NATIONALISM

If we didn't have to deal with this terrible menace, we could perhaps work out our racial problems more slowly and deliberately. But the emergence of the Communist threat in all its enormity has changed the picture radically. All Africa and Asia—almost the whole nonwhite world—is aflame with the spirit of nationalism. If this spirit isn't guided courageously and wisely by the West, especially by the United States; if the Communists should succeed, partly because of the race issue, in winning the favor of this tide of humanity—God help us all.

MONEY—MONEY—MONEY

Next we come to a phase in the fight which many who complain the loudest about communism would like to forget.

Money. Billions upon billions of dollars. Can we afford it? Without spending ourselves into bankruptcy?

Any American who isn't willing—together with fellow citizens and fellow men throughout the free world—to spend tremendous sums in fighting communism may as well forget all about combating it effectively.

We're not talking primarily about money for military defense. Most U.S. citizens are convinced, and rightly so, that one of the best ways of preparing for peace is to be so strong militarily that no one dare attack us.

We're talking now about spending to help the people of the "have not" nations help themselves.

This is not popular. But it is absolutely vital, in my opinion.

HAM VERSUS METRECAL

Here are the facts:

Sixty percent of the people in the world are trying to stay alive on the protein equivalent of one thin slice of ham a day.

At this moment, while millions of Americans are trying to pare off weight with low-calorie diets, billions of people suffer from lack of food.

Do you really believe that they will go on starving just because food might come from Communist sources rather than from the free world?

Russia and Red China cannot feed their own people adequately. But both of ruthless dictatorships, especially the Soviets, have starved millions of their own citizens in order to develop the science and industry that culminated in a sputnik and a cosmonaut.

Nor do they hesitate to send food to some obscure, newly emerging country—Chad, the Malagasy Republic, Dahomey, Gabon, Mali, Senegal, Niger, Brazzaville, Togo, Upper Volta—if they feel it will draw another nation behind the Iron or Bamboo Curtain.

RUNNING OUT OF OUR EARS

Last year the Communist countries, chiefly Russia, spent a billion dollars on foreign aid, while many of their own people were poorly fed.

Our country? We've spent much more. Private and church agencies alone distributed almost \$292 million in 1960 for foreign aid.

But remember: Despite this summer's drought in parts of our country, food is running out of our ears. We're trying desperately to get rid of it. And the amount we've given to a starving world—Federal plus church plus private assistance—is just

a drop in the bucket, compared with the need.

UPSET THE GRAIN MARKET?

The first step, then, is to get the food and the other necessities of life from the two-fifths of the world drowning under its surplus to the three-fifths hungrily reaching out for it.

The problems involved in this initial step alone—the danger of upsetting the world grain markets, etc.—would give pause to a Solomon. Trying to solve these matters even partially will cost vast sums of money.

Besides, after feeding the three-fifths of the world until the people have sufficient strength to grow their own food, we've got to teach them how to produce and preserve it.

This will take additional billions. But it can be done.

VACCINATED CHICKS

Much has been done already.

A Dutch agriculturist has upgraded crop production at least 300 percent in Pakistan by using the right kind of fertilizer.

Milk production rose 54 percent in El Salvador when a U.S. dairy farmer reorganized 82 farms in that country and set up 77 new ones.

Tens of thousands of chickens were snatched from disease in Thailand by a British specialist who developed a vaccine and inoculated the animals.

Example after example like these may be found in "That No Man Shall Hunger," by Maxwell S. Stewart (U.N. Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 304).

WE MUST SCORE

But licking the problem of hunger is only a starter. We'll have to teach these people how to build their economies—and their governments—and their schools.

We'll also have to teach them the superior values of a democratic society. Only we'll have to do our teaching much faster than the Communists do theirs. We must do this so much faster and send so much more money because we have two strikes against us in the uncommitted nations: (1) the race issue and (2) something for which the United States is not to blame but some other countries of the West are—the past record of colonialism. We must score some runs fast.

OUR LAST CHANCE

Expert after expert tells us that a vast area of northeastern Brazil—often referred to as the most poverty-stricken in all Latin America—is ripe for Castroism unless the free world moves in speedily with aid.

U.S. advisers tell our Government that things look so bad in Latin America that this may be our last chance to keep that area for the free world.

Once again, this will cost vast sums of money. If we are to do it successfully, that is. If we are not to use halfway measures which have so often nullified our aid programs in the past. "There's no use in building a bridge halfway across a river," as President Kennedy has said.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE APPROVES

The principle of foreign aid is now approved by most elements in our Nation, even by many who have been most reluctant to endorse it. Recently the U.S. Chamber of Commerce came out with a statement backing foreign aid, though it suggested a considerable cut in the President's request, recommending especially that no additional economic help be given to European countries now recovered from the ravages of war.

Objections to foreign aid today center almost entirely on the abuses and mismanagement in the program, not on the principle itself.

For Christians foreign aid has special

meaning. We have the direct command of God to feed the hungry, to visit those in prison, to help the sick. We ought to embrace this opportunity with joy, whether we have the privilege of doing it through our Federal Government, private agencies, or the church. Most likely we'll have to do it through all three—if it is to be done on the massive scale required to make it effective in the fight against communism.

WHERE DO WE GET THE MONEY?

And so we come to the big question. Where do we get the vast sums?

Our Nation's factories are now capable of turning out so much more goods than we ourselves can possibly use. We're up to our necks in almost everything: oil, feed grains, steel, clothes; you name it. With the rapid advance of automation U.S. plants can pour out this superabundance—at the same time laying off more and more workers.

Unless we build up the have not world to the point where teeming populations can buy the products of our factories, there is little doubt in the minds of many that financial disaster will overtake us.

THE NEAREST MIRROR

Nevertheless the objection that we spend ourselves into bankruptcy is valid. So what's the answer?

There is no one answer. It will take doing on many fronts.

We shall find one of the big answers by walking to the nearest mirror.

If the almost 105 million Christian church members in the United States will take seriously their God-directed responsibility to be good citizens; if they will really work at the job of helping run the government by strongly protesting to their legislative representatives against waste and mismanagement and corruption in almost every area of our government—then one facet of the problem is on the way to being solved.

THE 13-CENT COTTER PINS

Item: Last winter's strikes at our missile bases at Cape Canaveral for unheard-of wages.

Item: One of our Nation's biggest corporations selling cotter pins to the Navy for 13 cents each. Cotter pins that it bought from another corporation for little more than half a cent each.

Etc., etc., etc.

The U.S. General Accounting Office report to Congress on the waste and mismanagement in our Defense Establishment during 1960 is a real shocker.

This goes on year after year—to a greater or lesser degree—in almost every area of our Federal Government, including the foreign aid department.

Moreover, State and local governments are, if anything, worse in this respect. To quote the lead sentence of a June 23 United Press International story: "A thread of corruption spreads through the Nation's States and cities today as broad as some of the highways alleged to be crumbling because of it."

WOULDN'T WALK ACROSS THE STREET

Certainly ours is the greatest Government in the world. But it's a republic, a form of government in which the people themselves ultimately have the responsibility for its policies and administration. Our Government in the last analysis can be only as good and efficient as the people allow it to be.

Unfortunately the typical American, it has been said, will cross the ocean to fight for his country but will not cross the street to vote in a local election.

IF 105 MILLION U.S. CHRISTIANS

Christians, it would seem, have a special responsibility to make our Government work. As Edmund Burke put it so eloquently, "All that is necessary for evil to triumph is that good men do nothing."

If the almost 105 million Christian church members in the United States will finally get it through their heads that participation in politics is not a violation of the separation of church and state, that God wants them to help make their Government as effective as possible so that the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ can be done as efficiently as possible, that it is their Christian duty to talk or phone or write or wire to their legislative representatives demanding an end to waste and mismanagement and corruption—then we shall be on the way to saving the billions necessary to put the emerging nations on their feet without spending ourselves into bankruptcy.

CYNICS WILL LAUGH

Oh, I know. The cynics will laugh this off as hopeless idealism. It won't be that easy, they will say. Of course it won't. But Christians are not to be cynics. We are to be practical idealists.

This is a long-range process. I'm convinced, though, that enough good citizenship can be exercised now so that we can do what is necessary in a hurry.

One thing is certain: If Christians do not begin in ever-increasing numbers to take a more active part in running their government, the future looks very black indeed.

In the words of our President: "Let us begin."

THE \$1.77 FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS

Of supreme importance is this:

If we are to combat atheistic communism effectively, we Christians must bring to the multitudes of Asia and Africa and Latin America the Gospel of Jesus Christ. But fast.

That, too, will take huge sums of money. Much more than the \$1.77-per-person average given last year for foreign missions by U.S. Protestants in the 10 largest denominations, including the Missouri Synod.

Let us not belittle what the Christian church has done in this field in the past. Even non-Christians admit that up until and including recent years most of what was done to help the uncommitted nations was done by Christian missionaries, doctors, teachers, deaconesses.

But in view of what needs to be done the Christian church has been acting as if its foreign mission program were a sort of hobby—something to keep the ladies' aids and the men's clubs out of mischief—rather than something that's compellingly urgent as preached by the Savior and His first disciples.

STUFF FOR COMIC BOOKS

One dollar and seventy-seven cents per person per year. This ought to be written up in the comic books—if it weren't so tragic.

No wonder that—as Dr. H. H. Koppelman wrote in the July 11 issue of the Witness—"Percentage-wise the Christian church is losing out against other religions of the world. Of the major religions, Christianity is the only one experiencing such a decline."

God forgive us.

WILL THEY STEAL OUR MINDS?

That's why I say in all sincerity: I don't believe that most of us have the courage to fight communism. Not yet.

But I'm convinced that when we finally recognize the great need, when we apply ourselves earnestly to a study of the Gospel of Christ, the Holy Spirit will give us the courage. And the will.

In the final article we shall list specific ways in which the Christian church collectively and Christians individually can combat communism effectively. Especially how in a positive manner we can deal with the most dangerous threat of all, the diabolically clever effort to steal our minds.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of September 2, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS, SEPTEMBER 2, 1961

THE ENEMY WITHOUT AND WITHIN THE UNITED STATES¹

Communism today²

Current events, Berlin, Cuba, Brazil, the nuclear test ban, disarmament talk, relative military strengths, may obscure the basic struggle, largely undercover, going on through which the United States will nobly win or meanly lose the last great hope of men for peace on earth. Current legislative efforts and current events are overshadowed by this titanic struggle in which only one side will win. This is not and cannot be a stalemate. Ignorance of this is possible, remaining personally unaffected by it is not.

The Communists ceaseless efforts to subvert the remaining free nations, including the United States reached a turning point in last December's Communist meeting. The Red Manifesto then issued recognized the success of U.S. anti-Communist forces in understanding the Red plan of conquest. Their new doctrine, obligatory on all Communists, is to discredit and smear the United States anti-Communists, simultaneously pushing the new line which is "there is no danger of communism in the United States, but abroad." A gigantic effort, a "psywar" or mind warfare, brainwashing and indoctrination, is to lull all Americans into complacency thus facilitating the infiltration and subversion of our country, while the people sleep, a calculated effort to destroy our patriotism through a corrupting trance. By suppressing criticism of communism the people will think the danger is gone. Khrushchev brutally explained it "you spit in their faces and they call it dew."

To accomplish this there must be a double standard as they see it, that is, suppress criticism of communism as antisocial and violative of various civil liberties, but simultaneously step up criticism against the United States. An attempt to monopolize all news and communications media will be made, in which past success has been the rule. Anti-Communist material must be eliminated in schools, public meetings, and the military—more and new agents will infiltrate the Government to influence, stall, and frustrate Government policy and directives. Anti-Communist personnel in Government key spots must be squeezed out whenever possible. Character assassination, smears, rumors, even blackmail is to be used on any and all influential anti-Communists in and out of Government to discredit and remove them.

The success of their effort is chronicled by Senator THURMOND as he lists the tough, but accurate, anti-Communist material removed

from use by the military, such films as "Operation Abolition" and "Communism on the Map." Articles furthering this line have appeared in the Worker, the U.S. Communist paper, the New York Times, Washington Post, the Reporter, and others.

Senator THURMOND's strongest criticism is directed at the so-called Fulbright memorandum which he says, "candidly expresses as its major fear not the Communist menace but a grave distrust of the American people to govern themselves" and that, "the American people need to be restrained in their desire to hit the Communists with everything we've got, particularly if there are more Cubas and Laos."

The criticism of the memorandum lists these dangers: (1) the repeal of the directive which authorized the military anti-Communist seminars; (2) increased censorship of military speeches and others. Such muzzling further limits the widespread understanding of communism by our people. Their knowledge is what the Communists fear the most. To correct all this Senator THURMOND, and I agree, suggests an immediate full-scale investigation, now, before further success crowns the Communists in their determination to socialize and then communize the United States. To meet this danger we must know about communism and Communists. My effort here is directed toward that end. In knowledge, there is strength, without it we are easy prey. Let's look at what the Communists are up to:

"YOU CAN TRUST THE COMMUNISTS TO DO EXACTLY AS THEY SAY

"(By Dr. Fred Schwarz)

"Communists can be trusted to do exactly as they say once you understand their beliefs. They are dedicated, of deep conviction, superbly organized. Communists know they will conquer the world, it's only a matter of time. In keeping with their beliefs—not ours—they are predictable and understandable. Marx preached class warfare. Lenin proclaimed the Communist Party the instrumentality to win this worldwide war. Marx joined Feuerbach's materialism with Hegel's dialectic reasoning to provide dialectic materialism, the philosophic basis for communism's blueprint of conquest and enslavement of man's mind and badge.

"Class warfare exists between the bourgeois and proletariat, that is between the owner and worker, the wage payer and wage receiver, capital and wages, capitalism and socialism, hence between United States and Russia. The war is thus between nations as well as within nations not yet socialized. The war is to total victory and defeat with all weapons to be used, of the pen and the sword. Education, language, trade, diplomacy, negotiation, religion, cultural exchange, economic—in every field and in every way the battle is fought. The war will end with world domination.

"Peace then is the great goal. They believe in peace, everything is for peace, the peace following world victory. Every violent murder, the thousands and millions slain—these are acts of peace. No lie detector test of any Communist would show otherwise. Beyond rational argument and conviction, paranoid as it seems to us—peace is their definition for violence.

"Truth is whatever the Communists say it is. Once the top command, the 'politburo' has decreed a statement as true, it is the truth. Communists never lie by their definition. There are no absolutes in morals, only as relative to the class struggle, that is, war. Any statement that furthers communism's success is true, the contrary a lie. Their truth is that wherever communism comes to power there is happiness, health, prosperity, and good, and that American and capitalism are evil, degenerate, poor, and unhappy. The facts do not alter this truth, in their minds. They can murder and blame

us for their misdeeds, divorced apparently from their senses and this is to them the truth.

"Righteousness is to work, sacrifice and die for the party. Torture, murder, pillage, even their confessing to crimes uncommitted and accepting fellow Communist imposed execution is righteousness since by definition this advances the Communist [Party] clause.

"Love can be manifested by promising military officers no punishment if they surrender, and protection for their families, and then after surrender murdering the officers and disposing viciously of the women and children. To Communists this lying duplicity is unquestionably love for mankind, since it brings the glorious day of world communism closer to fruition. A lie detector test would so confirm their belief.

"What brings human beings to such a strange about face of morals? "Dialectical materialism" the basis for all communism holds that man is only matter in motion, as is everything, no more than an animal, although with more complex conditioned reflexes. Action is automatic and compulsory, no free will. Ultimate reality is material, not mental. Oddly enough, Hegel's dialectics brought to materialism devotion, sacrifice, initiative and dedication so that the Communist has an intense passionate dedication to make the inevitable happen. The dialectic teaches that progress is inherent in change, and everything changes constantly (this to be accepted by faith) so that what is seen is not so important as what will be. The future belongs to the Communist not because of evidence (as overcoming U.S. great strength) but because of faith in dialectics' what must be.

"The nature of progress is go forward then back a little, then forward. Communists believe in abolishing the family. Yet now they strengthen the family to accomplish world takeover. Then they'll abolish it. The logic or illogic here is fantastic. Religion the same. They will use it until they can abolish it, after conquering.

"The nature of conflict in dialectics is shown as thesis (communism) meets antithesis (capitalism) which clash results in synthesis (socialism). Socialism then evolves into communism. All matter in the world is likewise engaged in comparable clashes. So violent revolution is needed to change capitalism to socialism. Some Communists have held that capitalism will evolve into socialism, then communism.

"The ultimate goal of 'dialectical materialism,' world conquest, without God or deity, is to permit the Communist Party to so alter man's environment as to change human nature. Then there will be scientific regeneration of human beings into perfect beings. They will love to work and give their effort and proceeds to others. No hand will be lifted in anger. No crime, no violence, no police, no tax—only mutual cooperation.

"To accomplish this the world must be freed of capitalism and the profit motive. Those who are not agreeable will be killed, by the millions, if necessary. Those remaining will be reeducated. Children will be trained by Communists. Public prostitution will replace family life.

"Communists are recruited largely through appeal to student intellectuals, feeding on discontent. Four ideas are utilized: (a) Disenchantment with capitalism, which causes depressions and war, through imbalance of goods and money (this reasoning fails to recognize (1) the dynamic nature of money and credit, (2) advertising and psychology, (3) expanding market, (4) people's capitalism, individuals' enlarging ownership of property, (5) role of government (antitrust, etc.) and the facts which further show that capitalism has produced more prosperity than ever known, and is accompanied by freedom, not enslavement);

¹ Supplementary to last week's newsletter.

² Recap of—

1. Senator THURMOND statements.

2. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee Report, "The New Drive Against the Anti-Communist Program."

3. Dr. Fred Schwartz "You Can Trust the Communists To Do Exactly as They Say."

(b) materialist philosophy, a substitute for those who have doubts about religion and Deity, and are materialistic in leaning; (c) intellectual pride, an appeal to youthful learners who are delighted at freedom from family and old ideas, it appeals to the curious and those seeking new experiences; (d) unfulfilled religious need: A replacement for religion in sacrifice of oneself in a cause.

"A Communist is molded by the Communist Party, as a prerequisite to membership, through work, discipline, and complete obedience under observation. An intellectual elite is the core of the party who are able to control masses by superior knowledge and organization. The membership price is giving oneself completely, forswearing all else, including dying happily for the party, as did Bukharin, who said death is preferable than life outside the party.

"The organization is controlled from the top down. Local units or cells send a representative to the district council, whose representatives go to higher councils, ending finally in the presidium or politburo. Here decisions are reached by vote (although in practice those disagreeing with top leaders usually are later purged), votes always become unanimous. This is reported then to the Central Committee, and then to the lower echelons and all decisions are binding and without appeal. Any violation, as reported by secret police and informers, who are everywhere, is punishable by expulsion or death.

"Communists work through front organizations they established or through captive organizations they have infiltrated and captured. Communists work secretly or covertly usually. They work through fellow travelers who are not party members, who in turn work through sympathizers, who use pseudo-liberals, who rely on dupes, the latter being well-meaning patriotic citizens who give the money and the respectability. The techniques for seizing power stem from Lenin's belief in violent revolution to destroy the bourgeois and government, rather than use the existing government.

"Seizure of control can be accomplished by (1) internal revolt through control of labor unions, (2) military conquest or (3) military blackmail forcing peaceful surrender.

"Successful techniques for seizing power can be seen in (1) Russia after the Czar was overthrown Lenin's party of 40,000 promising peace and land (promises contradictory to Lenin's basic Communist doctrine but anything is permissible to come to power), beat out other parties, gave land to the peasants, took back the harvests, killed the peasants, starved out the complaining Ukraine (7 million), liquidated all opposing groups, collectivized the farms and enslaved everyone. (2) China: communism won over the students, and promised land, freedom from debt and exclusion of white people. Troops were trained and a brilliant combination of political infiltration followed by military conquest, plus guerrilla warfare, reduced the people still living to complete subjugation and enslavement. (3) Czechoslovakia (likened to technique being used on America): The Communists with massive military power ever present at a threat exacted a series of small concessions from the Czechs, each a small one, with war as an alternative. Meanwhile, Communist agents infiltrated the Government in key spots. In 3 years the takeover was complete.

"The consolidation of power is necessary after initial takeover. The people are disarmed. All potential leaders are killed. Communication media are monopolized, likewise education. The party has an economic monopoly, controlling all jobs. The secret police and informers spy on everyone. Revolts are stopped aborning and revolters killed. Promises and fear keep people in check. Freedom of movement and association are stopped. Mass trials and execu-

tions. Children are set against adults. Harvests are taken, and collective farms operated with a new slavery system as labor. This is a complete dictatorship. The Communist Party is supreme, controlled by the top man or men.

"Allies of communism are responsible for communism's success. The party is very small in number. The success is through getting others to do the work. What permits this? How is it possible?

"(a) Intellectual dishonesty: People believe what they want, and they refuse to believe that Communists are Communists and that they really intend to enslave the world. The evidences of Communist success are fivefold: (1) Numerical: Communists numbered 17 in 1903; 40,000 in 1917; 1 billion in 1959, 6 times the population of the United States, more than those who have ever heard of Christ. Five children are learning about communism now to one learning about Christ. How long then before the 2½ billion in the world are under Communist control? (2) Military: Communists may have military superiority by 1965. (3) Educational: Communists graduating 3 times the scientists (10 times including China) 100 times the language specialists. They stress science, mathematics, and language and learn without freedom. (4) Economic: The gap economically is closing. A greater percent of their national production goes into economic warfare since they control production and don't need profit. They can undersell us in any world market by choice, to create chaos and infiltrate agents. (5) Communications: Their literary crusade of books is directed toward the uncommitted nations of Asia and Africa and South America to tip the balance their way (another 1 billion people). Their children's books are good literature. In propaganda they seek to convey communism's goodness and capitalism's evil. They are reaching 100 people to our 1. (The truth of people fleeing from communism is never told.)

"(b) Cultural exchange: Since there is no freedom of movement or communication in Russia our visitors to Russia come back unwitting Communist agents.

"Brainwashing: Communist technique is accurate and destructive of the mind. Through exhaustion, confusion, chronic pain, and fear the person's established mental patterns are shattered. New memories, a guilt complex, and love for their torturers are replaced in new patterns. Indoctrination outside of brainwashing occurs through repetition of the big lie and good advertising techniques. Result is the creation of a false image of the United States throughout the world. They know it is not what we do that counts but what people believe we do. The fact that people flee communism and go to America is never told.

"For the United States to survive confronted with communism our people must have knowledge. We must render our anti-Communist program effective and Russia's anti-anti-Communist program ineffective. Thus far, we are victims, not of their hypocrisy, but of our own ignorance. Our success will hinge on three things: Our motivation, knowledge, and organization.

"Motivation: For the United States to survive this attack our citizens must understand communism and its terrible danger to the United States. We must reaffirm our beliefs in willingness to expend time, money and effort. We won't be hypnotized or lulled into slavery through apathy or failure to realize our great strengths—spiritual and moral—nor will we be so stupid as to be fooled into believing communism is no threat, so that infiltration and subversion can prepare us for the takeover. Our motivation is love of God and our fellow man—that means preserving our country and freedom.

"The knowledge we need is simply the realization that communism is not just an-

other economic system; it is tyranny, slavery, not freedom. We must study and know the tactics of the enemy and then abort his plans.

"The organization required is at the grassroots, not a super group or nationwide organization, just the dedicated perseverance of our many diversified religious, civic, and educational groups. We need not adopt regimentation. Self-discipline is the only discipline needed. Everyone fights communism right where he is.

"Conclusion

"We categorically reject this claim. We are not the helpless victims of our environment, doomed to destruction. The fault lies not in our environment but in ourselves. The political, judicial, educational, and cultural organizations of a free society can function only when the individual citizens have enlightened minds and are dedicated to the foundations of freedom. The basic responsibility rests on each one. The success of this book can be measured by the number of readers whose attention has been redirected from the responsibility of others to their own responsibility; who are asking the question, 'What can I do?' Upon such a foundation, the political, legislative, and cultural programs necessary can be built.

"Material forces alone do not determine the destinies of men. The resources of an infinite God can change the balance of material assets. These resources are liberated through the prayer, the sacrifice, and the intelligent organization of people filled with the love of God. Fundamentally, the problem is a moral and spiritual one. The foundations of freedom must be girded with a moral and spiritual revival. As free men humbly seek God and present their bodies, minds, and hearts to their country and the cause of all mankind, we may well believe that tyranny shall not triumph and freedom shall not perish from the earth."

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Borough of Brooklyn and the city of New York has given many distinguished citizens to the Nation. We are especially proud and happy to greet our distinguished colleague, the Honorable EUGENE KEOGH on this memorable day—the celebration of his birthday and his 25th year of service in the Congress of the United States. He is a very versatile leader and a loyal friend. His accomplishments are admired and respected. He has always given advice to new Members and is ever ready to serve their interests. To praise GENE KEOGH is not only a privilege on our part, but an open and honest acknowledgment of the great accomplishments that have been his in his great career in the House of Representatives. We greet him with true friendship on this momentous day and leave him in the warm embrace of his loving wife, Virginia, and his dear children, Susan and E. Preston. May God bless and keep him with us in the Congress for many years to come.

You Can Help Save America's Historic Treasures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting article by the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, which appeared in This Week magazine of the Boston Herald Traveler on Sunday, September 3, 1961:

YOU CAN HELP SAVE AMERICA'S HISTORIC TREASURES

(By the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, Congresswoman, 22d Ohio District)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A few years ago grieving Charlestonians watched a wrecking crew tear down the beautiful, 152-year-old Orphan's Chapel to make room for five more cars in a parking lot.

The city of Bridgeport, Conn., recently sent wreckers across a picket line of angry preachers and housewives to tear down the Harral-Wheeler mansion, a 115-year-old landmark and example of the Gothic revival in America.

Despite the unanimous plea from the New Jersey assembly and senate to save the building, the Stevens Institute of Technology has just demolished Castle Stevens, a 105-year-old Victorian landmark on New Jersey's Hudson River shore.

All over our land the bulldozer is pushing over some of the most charming and important reminders of our past. To make room for service stations, parking lots, super-highways, and the other structures demanded by a machine civilization, we have already razed 4 out of 10 of the historic buildings that were standing in 1941.

The destruction is not, I have learned, inevitable. Vigorous and organized protests can save irreplaceable historic buildings threatened with demolition. Charlestonians, for instance, have put aside their grief over the Orphan's Chapel to fight for the 112-year-old customhouse, a superb example of the Classic Revival of a century ago.

All these struggles may be hard, but it is far harder to restore a building once it has been destroyed. Right now, for example, a struggle is going on in Philadelphia to rebuild the house in which Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence. Today the site of the original building is occupied by a hotdog stand. Independence Hall Association is working at the task of raising \$475,000 to restore the handsome brick house—far more than to preserve the original.

If you are afraid that your community will lose a legacy from the past—a neo-classical mansion soon to be razed for a trailer sales park, a log-cabin schoolhouse to be torn down for a concrete cloverleaf, a battlefield to be buried under a housing development—then speak up, and loudly. As a veteran of many successful preservation battles, I know it can be done.

In 1957, for example, the woodland on the Potomac River's Maryland shore opposite Mount Vernon was threatened by the spread of Washington's suburbs. I helped found the Accokeek Foundation to save the unspoiled river bank and the view from Washington's home. I was heartened by the help that came from any quarters once the work was started, but somebody had to make the first move.

If you need encouragement to make that vital first move, consider these battles that were won by determined citizens:

Louisiana antiquarians angrily and stubbornly resisted when the local government tried to build a sewage plant on the battlefield where Andrew Jackson stood off the British at New Orleans. The plant site was finally changed. And the battlefield is now part of the Chalmette National Historical Park.

When a 100-year-old upstate New York church was threatened, a Cornell student who had worshiped there as a child bought it with \$675 from his own pocket and saved it for a civic meeting hall.

Four citizens of Savannah have saved the houses in historic Marshall Row by buying them; they will resell at the same price to anybody who will restore the buildings and put them to good use.

One determined woman in Tombstone, Ariz., sold shares in a frankly played-out mine to find money to preserve the town's frontier appearance.

In Massachusetts the Walden Citizen's Committee of Concord, is a stubborn body of citizens who refused to admit the fight was lost even after Thoreau's Walden Pond had been made into a public swimming hole. They kept on fighting in the courts and recently the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court ordered the county to change the pond back to the forest lake it was in the time of Emerson and Thoreau.

If you want to save an historic site in your community, remember this: The law is on your side. The courts have held that a community has a right to protect itself from loss of its historic heritage.

But before you spend your energy, be sure that the fight is worthwhile. Just because a building is old does not mean that it is worth saving.

Ask yourself these questions before you try to save a threatened structure or area:

1. Does it have true historic or cultural worth?
2. Is it still in good enough condition to be worth restoring?
3. Can the public get to it, and will it be useful after restoration?
4. Can we pay for the restoration, and can we maintain the building in good condition afterward?

If you can answer "Yes" to these questions, your next step is to enlist help. Look for help close about you: Not to distant foundation or Federal departments. Nobody will listen to you until you have a well-organized program at home. You can find help at the chamber of commerce, local newspapers, civic groups, patriotic associations, historical societies, or any of the local institutions interested in public matters.

Shrewd organizers will get powerful help by pointing out to local businessmen that U.S. tourists will spend more than \$26 billion this year.

After you have organized a local preservation group, you can ask for help from larger groups, most notably the National Trust for Historic Preservation, a group chartered by Congress to help save historic "sites, buildings, and objects significant in American history and culture." Write them at 815 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C. They will help you by:

1. Providing suggestions to help you decide if the project is worth your effort.
2. Judging your chances for success.
3. Advising on organization and fundraising.
4. Telling you how best to spend the money you raise and use the building you save.

If you think a speaker from the national trust would help impress the importance of your project on local civic clubs, or if you

think an experienced staffer would help to guide a legal effort to save your project, the trust will send you a troubleshooter for the price of his travel ticket.

Trust staffers know all the tricks on both sides. They can tell you from hard experience how not to be stabbed in the back; they can show you how to use every legal weapon in the book—and there are legal weapons strong enough to win most preservation battles if you are stubborn enough to keep fighting.

Sometimes you think that nobody cares, that the fight is not worth the cost—but when you finally win, when the bulldozer is turned aside and your historic building is saved, you feel a tremendous surge of pride in a job well done.

Beware of Russ Flights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, personally, I was pleased to note the recent decision of the State Department to break off negotiations with the Soviet Union relative to direct flights between Moscow and New York that were contemplated.

I am well aware of the fact that the rising international tensions are the official reason for the termination of the negotiations. I am also aware of the fact, as are most Members of Congress, that the increased international tensions arise in part from deliberate Soviet belligerence based on their premise that our State Department will vacillate under pressure and make great concessions to them in forthcoming diplomatic conferences.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it of special significance that the Chicago Daily Calumet editorial of Friday, August 25, has directed its editorial to some very practical reasons for refusing to permit the Soviet Reds to penetrate our shores with their Government-operated airlines. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the editorial entitled "Beware of Russ Flights":

Beware of Russ Flights

We live in a curious, as well as a grim and unpredictable time.

Relations between this country and the Soviet Union never were more tense. There is a strong feeling that a final showdown over Berlin—a showdown which conceivably could lead to war—will come this fall or winter.

Yet various kinds of relations and negotiations between the two nations go on. Among them has been a meeting to discuss a commercial air treaty.

The American negotiators have been warned to keep on their toes in this and the idea of Russia-to-America flights has been vetoed by the administration for the time being. It's just as well this way for it wasn't a good deal to start with.

The American line which would be permitted to fly to Russia would be Pan American World Airways, a private enterprise which must pay its own way and attempt

to make some kind of profit for its 40,000 stockholders.

The Soviet line is Aeroflot, a branch of the Soviet Air Force and a wholly owned arm of the Soviet Government. Profit and costs mean nothing to it. Significantly, the Soviet negotiator is a Soviet Air Force general.

Aeroflot, moreover, is a potent and expanding instrument in the Soviet Government's economic offensive against the whole free world. Given a chance, it could present unmeetable competition because it would have no regard for operating losses.

The Reds would love this chance to demonstrate their superiority with all the cards stacked in their favor if we're dumb enough to take the bait.

Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which Mr. Ernest H. Gaunt, of Orlando, Fla., has asked me to insert for the information and consideration of the Members of the House of Representatives:

ORLANDO, FLA., August 10, 1961.

Hon. A. SYDNEY HERLONG, Jr.,
House Member from Florida, House Office
Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HERLONG: The search for tax loopholes, in which I understand the Ways and Means is engaged, and the proposal submitted to that committee for a current census of wealth including a public listing of all tax exemptions—National, State, and local—is not a new idea.

When William the Conqueror became King of England (latter part of the 11th century), he instituted a remarkable historical document called Domesday book which was a complete inventory of all wealth throughout England. The current proposal to the Ways and Means Committee showed, with carefully researched figures, the apparent fact that two-thirds of our national wealth is tax exempt—leaving the unbearable burden of mounting taxation on the remaining one-third.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, was reported on August 8, 1961, in the Orlando Sentinel as speaking vigorously on one aspect of tax exemptions, private foundations. But there are other aspects of tax exemptions which probably need more serious investigation and consideration.

For example, tax-exempt Federal Government property is reliably estimated as \$276 billion. Could not at least one-half of this be sold to private owners who would pay taxes? And, the estimated total of all tax-exempt property in the United States is \$661 billion compared with total national wealth of \$898 billion.

The Federal Government is the largest in the Nation of: holders of grazing land and of timberland; owners of grain; warehouse operators; shipowners; truck fleet operators; electric power producers; landlords and tenants; lenders and borrowers; insurers and insured.

In the July Readers Digest is an article condensed from the Harvard Business Review titled "Big Danger in Big Government," by

Paul Mazur, an outstanding economist and banker. It points out that the increases in taxation will in the end make it impossible for the Government itself to raise as much money as it really needs.

"Something's got to give." An up-to-date inventory of all tax exemptions including the \$20 billion of tax-exempt bonds (also of all Government grants and subsidies and special tax privileges) seems to be an order of first importance. With the national debt nearly \$300 billion, the interest on which comes from the taxpayers—isn't it time to reappraise the whole national financial picture? In a book by Jerry Voorhis, "Out of Debt—Out of Danger" it is pointed out that under President Andrew Jackson the national debt was zero. Another book by Freeman Tilden, "A World in Debt" treats of the same subject.

The desirability or undesirability of any particular tax exemptions can only be judged by the people if they have at hand all pertinent facts.

Sincerely,

ERNEST H. GAUNT.

The Rights and Wrongs of Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the September issue of Pageant magazine.

Mr. W. V. Levy has done an excellent opinion survey of the Governors of our States. Since they hold it in their hands to initiate action toward the abolition of the death penalty at the State level their views are particularly interesting. We in the Congress hold the power to abolish capital punishment in the Federal judicial system and in the District of Columbia and I sincerely hope that we will take advantage of that power in the near future. Toward that end I have introduced H.R. 829 which would prohibit the imposition of the death penalty in the District of Columbia and H.R. 844 which would prohibit it in all Federal jurisdictions.

The article follows:

THE RIGHTS AND WRONGS OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT (By W. V. Levy)

Does the death penalty make murderers of us all? Today there are those who say not even society should take a human life.

Blonde Edythe Klumpp, an attractive divorced mother of three, stood before a judge in a Cincinnati courtroom on a July day in 1959 and heard the sober, dispassionate words that condemned her to death for the murder of her lover's wife.

A jury had convicted her—without recommendation of mercy—of shooting and beating Mrs. William Bergen, stuffing the body into the trunk of a car, and burning it. Over a 2-year period, her attorneys appealed the case to higher courts, but without success. Her last flickering hope for life rested in executive clemency from Gov. Michael V. DiSalle, an articulate foe of capital punishment.

As he has done in all capital cases that

have come before him since assuming office almost 3 years ago, DiSalle initiated a personal investigation. He granted two stays of execution. He interviewed the condemned woman several times in prison, and, finally, was present when a psychiatrist administered sodium amytal, a so-called truth serum. Based on Mrs. Klumpp's responses while under the drug, DiSalle commuted her death sentence to life imprisonment early this year and indicated, pending further study, that she might ultimately be freed.

DiSalle's widely publicized action angered law enforcement officers, just as it drew unrestrained praise from opponents of capital punishment—adding fuel to the already raging controversy over legal executions, an issue that is troubling men's minds as never before.

This year, legislation to abolish capital punishment was introduced in almost half the 41 States in which it is still on the books. Squarely in the middle of the tugging lobbies on each side of the debate are the Governors of the States—men like Michael DiSalle.

Because State Governors frequently—and literally—hold the power of life and death in their hands, and because they are in a strong position to influence legislators in their deliberations, Pageant, in an exclusive survey, went directly to the chiefs of the 50 States. How do they feel about the death penalty—and about their own powers regarding it?

Of the 33 Governors who responded to Pageant's questions, 16 said they were opposed to capital punishment, primarily because they felt it was morally wrong and did not serve as an effective deterrent. (These are key arguments of organized abolition groups.)

Eight favored legal executions.

Six indicated that their support for the death penalty was predicated on existing statutes in their States.

Three formally declined comment.

Among the group solidly against legal executions were the Governors of four of the Nation's most populous States: DiSalle, of Ohio; Edmund (Pat) Brown, of California; Otto Kerner, Jr., of Illinois; and David L. Lawrence, of Pennsylvania.

The others opposed are John H. Reed, of Maine; John A. Nette, of Rhode Island; John B. Swainson, of Michigan; Elbert N. Carvel, of Delaware; Wesley Powell, of New Hampshire; John M. Dalton, of Missouri; Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon; Orval E. Faubus, of Arkansas; J. Millard Tawes, of Maryland; William F. Quinn, of Hawaii; Gaylord A. Nelson, of Wisconsin; and Elmer L. Anderson, of Minnesota.

Governor DiSalle, who once argued in favor of capital punishment during a debate in his freshman year in college and later, as a member of the Ohio Legislature, introduced and followed to passage a measure making kidnaping a capital offense in the State, admitted that during the ensuing years he had changed his mind.

"Each time I think of the ritual that we go through in disposing of human life," he told the Ohio Legislature in a special message on capital punishment, "I wonder why we don't use the tomtoms and the wild, abandoned tribal dances which were so necessary in the past to create the emotional pitch before indulging in the lust for the taking of a human being's life."

To a man like DiSalle, who has come to oppose capital punishment after thoroughly exploring arguments in its favor and even supporting these arguments for a time, the exercise of executive clemency must necessarily be a matter requiring profound thought. During the first 30 months of his tenure, he commuted four death sentences and permitted three prisoners to die in the electric chair.

"I have made it a practice not to interfere with the judgment of a court or a jury unless there is mitigating evidence that was not presented before the court," he said.

One of the three men for whom DiSalle refused to intervene was Cop Killer Walter Byman. But the night of Byman's execution in the Ohio Penitentiary electric chair was painful for Ohio's chief executive.

DiSalle said that before the execution he notified the State highway patrol that he would be in his auto and available to them by radio.

"I did not want them to know exactly where I was," he recalled. "Shortly afterward, the words came over the radio, 'Warden reports detail completed 8:07.' The detail, what was it? The taking of a man's life. What did we accomplish by it?"

"The next morning I woke up with a very empty feeling. The State the night before had gone through with its ritual, had given a man a choice of what he wanted for a last meal. We had carefully shaved his head, we had cut slits in his trousers so that electric current could not be deterred in any fashion, and then we put him in the electric chair before witnesses.

"We, members of a humane and civilized society, had cold-bloodedly and with premeditation taken a life—which did not restore a life; had performed an act which served no purpose, which deterred no one. And then in the end there was that empty feeling that this life was gone and no useful purpose had been served."

California's outspoken Governor Brown ranks with DiSalle as an opponent of capital punishment. Brown was caught up in the worldwide controversy which developed last year when—since he felt unable under California law to prevent it—he allowed Convict-Author Caryl Chessman to go to the San Quentin Penitentiary gas chamber after an 11-year-10-month battle for life.

Brown pointed out that in 1955 there were 417 homicides in California. But only 52 defendants were convicted of first degree murder. And only eight—or 2 percent—were sentenced to death.

"There can be no meaningful exemplary value in a punishment the incidence of which is but 1 in 50," said Brown.

Reflecting on the matter of executive clemency, Brown told Pageant: "In the last analysis, there are no rules and few guides except a man's own quiet conscience and a feeling for what seems to be the right decision. Each case is unlike any other. Each is its own way of sorrows."

Fortunately, many Governors are spared this agonizing need to come to the "right decision" because their power to commute depends solely on a recommendation from the State pardon and parole commission.

The Governors in Pageant's survey who favor retention of the death penalty are S. Ernest Vandiver, of Georgia; Price Daniel, of Texas; Frank B. Morrison, of Nebraska; Donald Nutter, of Montana; Norman A. Erbe, of Iowa; F. Ray Keyser, Jr., of Vermont; J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., of Virginia; and Buford Ellington, of Tennessee. They vary, however, in the degree of their advocacy. Many believe that it serves as a deterrent to violent crimes, but should be used only in cases of extreme viciousness.

"Although admittedly there is room for argument upon this point, I believe that retention of the death penalty has a deterrent effect upon criminals and upon crime, and I would not at this time favor its abolition," said Ellington.

Somewhere in the middle were Governors such as Grant Sawyer, of Nevada, who said, "I have serious reservations concerning both the morality and effectiveness of capital punishment. I am, however, sworn to uphold the laws of my State and shall do so until such time as they are changed."

"There are weighty arguments on both sides of this question," said Gov. Robert B. Meyner, of New Jersey. "I have tried to keep an open mind on it because of the possibility that legislation affecting the death penalty may come before me."

What are the pros and cons in this argument over man's right to take a human life? They usually boil down to three categories—religious, moral, and statistical. And both sides quote the Bible to substantiate arguments.

"Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed" (Genesis 9: 6), and "He that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword" (Revelations 3: 10) are quotations frequently offered by those favoring capital punishment.

The abolitionists retort with such quotations as "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord" (Romans 12: 19), or "Judge not that ye be judged not" (Luke 6: 37).

One of the most significant breakthroughs for the abolitionists was a decision in March 1961 by the Protestant Episcopal Church to work aggressively for abolition of the death penalty. Episcopalians were urged to help create a climate of public opinion that would induce State legislatures to abolish legal executions.

Previously, the Methodist Church, the American Baptist Convention, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the United Presbyterian Church in the United States, and numerous other religious groups had raised their voices in a chorus of opposition to capital punishment.

Moral and statistical arguments against capital punishment fill volumes, and many of them were advanced by the Governors in the Pageant survey. But a nine-item indictment of capital punishment presented to and approved by the Delaware Legislature in 1958 reduces to simplest terms the basic thesis against legal executions:

"1. The evidence clearly shows that execution does not act as a deterrent to capital crimes.

"2. The serious offenses are committed, except in rare instances, by those suffering from mental disturbances; are impulsive in nature; and are not acts of the 'criminal class.' Of those executed in Delaware, 50 percent had no previous conviction.

"3. When the death sentence is removed as a possible punishment, more convictions are possible with fewer delays.

"4. Unequal application of law takes place because those executed are the poor, the ignorant and the unfortunate without resources.

"5. Conviction of the innocent does occur and death makes a miscarriage of justice irrevocable. Human judgment cannot be infallible.

"6. The State sets a bad example when it takes a life. Imitative crimes and murder are stimulated by executions.

"7. Legally, taking a life is useless and demoralizing to the general public. It also is demoralizing to the public officials, who, dedicated to rehabilitating individuals, must callously put a man to death. The effect on fellow prisoners can be imagined.

"8. A trial where a life may be at stake is highly sensational, adversely affects the administration of justice, and is bad for the community.

"9. Society is amply protected by life imprisonment."

Based on these points—and supporting testimony—Delaware became the seventh State in the Nation to abolish capital punishment. The number jumped to nine when Hawaii and Alaska entered the Union. (Hawaii had abolished the death penalty in 1955, and Alaska in 1957.)

The movement to abolish capital punishment in the United States began more than 100 years ago. In 1847, Michigan became the

first State to abolish the death penalty, and was followed by Rhode Island in 1852, Wisconsin in 1853, Minnesota in 1911, and North Dakota in 1915. Maine first abolished the death penalty in 1876, restored it in 1883, and then removed it from the statutes again in 1887.

However, three of these States permit the death penalty under extreme circumstances—Michigan for treason; Rhode Island for murder committed while serving a life sentence, and North Dakota for either of these crimes.

Nine other States abolished the capital penalty for short periods, only to restore it after a particularly vicious crime.

Those who favor legal execution maintain vigorously that its value as a deterrent upon would-be rapists, murderers and kidnappers is immense, although they often readily admit this cannot be proved by statistics.

Although J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, is a strong advocate of the death penalty, nevertheless he has said: "There is nothing so precious in our country as the life of a human being—whether he is a criminal or not. On the other side of the scale must be placed all the legal safeguards that our society demands.

"Experience has clearly demonstrated, however, that the time-proved deterrents to crime are sure detection, swift apprehension and proper punishment. Each is a necessary ingredient. Law-abiding citizens have a right to expect that the efforts of law-enforcement officers in detecting and apprehending criminals will be followed by realistic punishment.

"It is my opinion," Hoover concluded, "that when no shadow of a doubt remains relative to the guilt of a defendant, the public interest demands capital punishment be invoked when the law so provides."

Legislative skirmishing so far this year has proved decisively that lawmakers tend to agree with Hoover and are still reluctant to surrender longstanding rights of legal execution. Legislatures in State after State spurned attempts to eliminate the death penalty.

Despite the fact that the States themselves have been hesitant about abolishing capital punishment, they have certainly become more restrained in their actual use of the death penalty, largely because of the growing feeling against it. If the trend of the last 10 years is any barometer, capital punishment could virtually become extinct by the end of this century without the changing of another statute.

With an occasional deviation from the pattern, the number of executions has declined steadily each year since 1951, when 105 persons were executed.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, which issued a comprehensive report last March, only 57 persons were executed in 1960, the second lowest total since the Bureau began compiling statistics in 1930. The previous low was 49, in each of the years 1958 and 1959. Highest number of executions in any single year was 199, in 1936.

The growing public attitude of opposition to the taking of a prisoner's life was clearly reflected in a Gallup poll last year, when, at the height of the war of nerves and words over the Chessman case, only 51 percent of Americans questioned said they favored the death penalty. Thirty-six percent of the respondents were opposed to legal executions and 13 percent were undecided.

In 1953, 68 percent of those polled by Gallup said they were in favor of capital punishment, while 25 percent were opposed and 7 percent undecided.

As further evidence of rising antipathy toward the death penalty, prosecutors in various sections of the country report it is be-

coming increasingly difficult to select juries for capital cases. More and more prospective jurors automatically disqualify themselves because of admitted opposition to legal execution.

Last year, the grim hand of the executioner reached into 20 States. Five States accounted for 37 of the 57 deaths. California sent nine men to the gas chamber at San Quentin, including Chessman. Arkansas and Texas each executed eight persons, and Georgia and New York each sent six to the electric chair.

Forty-five of the executions were for murder, eight for rape, two for kidnaping, one for robbery, and one for aggravated assault by a life prisoner.

Over the 30-year period covered by the latest Bureau of Prisons report, 3,724 convicts have walked the so-called last mile. Yet this was only a bare fraction of the actual number of persons found guilty of capital crimes. The rest were spared by merciful juries, judges, and Governors.

Almost two-thirds of the country's executions since 1930—2,235—have taken place in the South. Georgia, which this year turned down a measure which would have raised the minimum execution age from 16 to 18, led the South and the Nation with 358 executions. The heavily populated Northeast took the lives of 598 prisoners, including 325 in New York State; the North Central States executed 384 (led by Ohio's 167), and the West (led by California with 271) killed 476.

As the abolitionists this year renewed their efforts toward eliminating capital punishment, obviously those with the most to gain by any reversal of existing laws were the 210 prisoners under sentence of death in penitentiaries from New York to California.

By year's end, some 50 to 60 of these prisoners will have been executed. Many will wait out nagging weeks, months—even years—while attorneys exhaust every legal move to reverse the death sentence. A handful will have their sentences commuted.

Perhaps next year many of these condemned prisoners will find the specter of death has been laid for them by the action of sympathetic legislatures. Certainly the American League for the Abolition of Capital Punishment (a national nonprofit organization headquartered in Brookline, Mass.) and other like-thinking groups operating in 24 States are pledged to keep working diligently in that direction.

And, as the Pageant survey shows, a surprising number of public officials are on their side.

COMMENTS OF VARIOUS GOVERNORS

William F. Quinn, Hawaii: "I am opposed to capital punishment on the grounds that this form of punishment has never proved to be an effective deterrent to crime, and its abolition has not brought about a rise in what would have been capital crimes."

Price Daniel, Texas: "I feel that our juries should retain their authority to impose death sentences for extreme crimes such as malicious murder and the sale of heroin to children. I believe that the death penalty is a deterrent to premeditated murder."

Orval E. Faubus, Arkansas: "I would like to see the abolition of capital punishment. However, I doubt if it is possible or in the best interests of society at the present time."

Otto Kerner, Illinois: "I am against capital punishment."

J. Millard Tawes, Maryland: "The idea of taking a human life is repellent to me personally, but I have taken the position that the establishment of criminal penalties is a legislative matter and is not part of my function as chief executive."

Norman A. Erbe, Iowa: "I believe the death penalty should be retained in Iowa."

John B. Swainson, Michigan: "I am opposed to capital punishment. Statistics tend to show that the incidence of capital crimes in Michigan is not significantly different from that of comparable States having capital punishment. It pleases me to say that the State of Michigan has never executed an innocent person. This same positive statement cannot be made in States which do impose a death penalty."

Edmund G. Brown, California: "• • • The naked, simple fact is that the death penalty has been a gross failure. Beyond its horror and incivility, it has neither protected the innocent nor deterred the wicked. The recurrent spectacle of publicly sanctioned killing has cheapened human life and dignity without the redeeming grace which comes from justice meted out swiftly, even humanely."

"The death penalty is invoked too randomly, too irregularly, too unpredictably, and too tardily to be defended as an effective example warning away wrongdoers."

J. Lindsay Almond, Virginia: "The death penalty is imposed in Virginia only in the most aggravated of capital cases."

"The fixing of the sentence is a jury function, unless the jury is waived by mutual consent of the prosecutor and the defense counsel. Our supreme court has been careful in its review of such matters I feel, therefore, that capital punishment in these instances is warranted."

Donald Nutter, Montana: "Our Montana statutes presently provide for capital punishment and at this time I see no justification for a change."

Matthew E. Welsh, Indiana: "As Governor of Indiana, it is my responsibility to uphold the laws of the State, which do provide for capital punishment. As long as those laws remain on our statute books, I have no alternative but to enforce them."

Mark O. Hatfield, Oregon: "I am opposed to capital punishment for three principal reasons. The largest number of those who receive the death sentence are from the lower income brackets. This would seem to indicate that this group cannot afford the necessary legal counsel which would enable them to present an effective case in their behalf."

"There is a great deal of inequity in the application of capital punishment. In other words, local customs and mores appear to influence whether one who commits a capital crime will be sentenced to death."

"Capital punishment is final. It does not take into account the possibility of human error, and there is no room for flexibility."

Farris Bryant, Florida: "Capital punishment is the law of the State of Florida. As Governor, it is my duty, unpleasant though it may be, to carry out the laws as created by our legislature."

Frank B. Morrison, Nebraska: "I recognize that society must protect itself; if capital punishment is necessary to serve that end, it may be justified—but only in very unusual and extreme circumstances, where the public welfare without question demands it. Statistics show that capital punishment, as such, does not decrease the crime of murder and cannot be justified on that basis; in fact, evidence indicates that sensational executions tend to increase rather than decrease crimes of violence."

David Lawrence, Pennsylvania: "I have been against capital punishment all my life because I firmly believe that the commandment 'Thou shalt not kill' means just what it says. For the same reason, I am opposed to war. I don't think we should take human life. I think it should be a matter for the Almighty himself to decide when we come in and go out of this world. I think people, pretty generally, have become convinced that the execution of an individual is not a deterrent to murder."

Ernest Vandiver, Georgia: "I feel that capital punishment does accomplish, to some degree, its primary purpose of deterring premeditated murder."

Albert D. Rosellini, Washington: "Under the State constitution, I am charged with the responsibility of upholding the laws of the State regardless of my personal feelings. A long time ago, the State legislature decided that capital punishment should exist. Unless some future legislature changes the law, it is my duty to uphold it. Capital punishment, then, becomes a policy matter which must be decided by members of the Washington State Legislature, who in practice reflect the will of the people."

John M. Dalton, Missouri: "I am opposed to capital punishment, but my job is to administer the laws of Missouri."

Labor Day 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, since 1961 is the 100th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's first annual message to Congress, this Labor Day is the appropriate time to recall this passage from that brilliant communication:

Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights.

Setting aside a day in recognition of America's working people did not come about for more than two decades after this excellent expression of labor's proper status, and another twoscore years elapsed before the full membership of our States began to observe the first Monday of September as Labor Day. Thus this honor to the men and women who are the predominant force in the Nation's population and character was long in coming into being, but in recent years the event has had increasingly more significance.

While labor must still devote considerable effort to organizational work, general recognition of the union movement as a component of the Nation's economic structure permits leaders to give more attention to the union's role in society's overall development. Energy once devoted to defending the right to organize and bargain collectively may now be used, in cooperation with management, toward attaining the objectives necessary to proper economic and social balance.

The holiday also has its unhappy aspects. Neither labor, management, nor Government can overlook the necessity of returning job opportunities to the millions of workers who are unemployed through no fault of their own. On the contrary, all elements must join hands in seeking whatever adjustments are required in the economic order to eliminate the surplus labor conditions that are

prevalent in so many regions of our country.

Labor Day is the proper time to renew our dedication to the task of making the realignments essential to provide work for everyone who wants to work. In common cause, and with the help of God, we must all devote ourselves to the fulfillment of that ideal.

Control of the Military and General Walker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, I spoke to the residents of my district over radio station KLRA in Little Rock on the subject of control of our military men. Because this topic is of such great importance at the moment, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of this address in the RECORD:

RADIO BROADCAST BY CONGRESSMAN DALE ALFORD, OF ARKANSAS, RADIO STATION KLRA, LITTLE ROCK, ARK., SEPTEMBER 3, 1961

One of the topics receiving the most attention in debate in the halls of Congress recently has been that of civilian control of the military services of our country. It is strange, indeed, that this subject should be up for debate when world tensions are now focused near the boiling point. The military of our country have always been and are at this present moment distinctly different from the military of other nations in that our military is unmistakably subservient to civilian control. The officers and men of our Armed Forces take an oath to defend our beloved land against all enemies, foreign and domestic. Please note that the wording of this oath is to defend our country against domestic enemies as well as foreign enemies. Our military leaders have led us, our brothers and our sons into bloody battles against the Communist enemy. It is the duty of every military leader to know the nature of the enemy so that he and his men can be better equipped to defend our Nation against the enemy. America's enemy today is international communism.

Despite the fact that the United States is in a so-called cold war, economic, political, and psychological, against communism, there is increasing evidence that many persons of high political position are not properly informed as to the nature of our enemy, international communism—or, what is infinitely worse, they are completely duped by the psychological warfare methods of our socialist enemy. The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, stated that "we cannot hope to successfully meet the Communist menace unless there is a wide knowledge and understanding of its aims and designs." In a recent address in the U.S. Senate, Senator STROM THURMOND said: "The events of recent years provide unimpeachable proof that we do not understand the nature or methods of Communists and communism. Had we understood and appreciated the menace of communism, we would not today be suffering from the losses of our blind negotiations at Yalta and Potsdam. Had we understood and recognized communism when we saw it, we

would never have made the mistake of officially characterizing the Red Communist Chinese as agrarian reformers. Senator THURMOND continued: "Had we the ability to detect a Communist and a Communist movement, Castro would never have had our support in establishing a Communist dictatorship over the Cuban people 90 miles from our shores." Recently, however, the American people have shown real evidence of their awakening to the web that is being woven around us to destroy our Constitution, our economy of free enterprise, and our very way of life, Western Christian civilization.

There is definitely a campaign now on foot to destroy the strong anti-Communist crusade that is, at long last, sweeping our land. In other words, we are now witnessing from the leftwing element, political as well as press, an anti-anti-Communist campaign. This anti-anti-Communist campaign is particularly directed at the military. The Communists have for years made no secret of their campaign to discredit our military leaders. Recently, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a resolution by the Communist International of 1921 meeting in New York City calling upon members of the Communist Party to launch a campaign against the military leaders. As Senator THURMOND has pointed out in recent addresses, this "gag the military line" is cogently illustrated by the space devoted to the subject in the August 13, 1961, edition of the Communist Party, U.S.A., organ, the Worker. Among the articles devoted to the anti-anti-Communist propaganda effort is one headlined on page 1, entitled "Rightist Plotters Open Attack in Senate." This article consists of a perverted account of the discussion which has taken place in the Senate concerning the use of military officers and facilities for alerting military personnel and the public to the menace of the cold war under the 1958 National Security Council directive.

The most glaring example of purging the military for their efforts to inform their troops and all Americans of the true nature of our enemy was the reckless recall of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker from his post as commander of the 24th Infantry Division in Germany. I am proud to say that there is a group now forming on Capitol Hill in Washington known as the Congressional Committee for Justice for General Walker. I have the honor of being temporary chairman of this group for both parties of the House of Representatives who are working to secure justice for an American soldier whose only crime was patriotism.

Recently, the Patrick Henry League, Box 383, Main Post Office, Yonkers, N.Y., published release No. 18 with the topic, "General Walker." Because their review of this situation is so concise and to conserve time, I shall quote extensively from this publication by the Patrick Henry League:

"Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker was born in 1909 at Center Point, Tex. He was appointed to the U.S. Military Academy on July 1, 1927, and gave his life from then on to the service of his country.

"He served in the following campaigns: Aleutian Islands, Naples-Foggia, Anzio, Rome, Arno, south France, Rhineland, central Europe, U.N. summer-fall offensive in Korea, second Korean winter, Korea summer-fall 1952, and third Korean winter.

"He won military honors fighting up the Italian boot and into southern France and Germany during World War II. Later, he was decorated during the Korean war. As commander of the 2d Division Artillery at Heartbreak Ridge, he led his men in firing a record of 22,000 rounds every 24 hours for 14 days.

"General Walker's awards include the Silver Star, the Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, the Senior Paratrooper Badge, the French Croix de

Guerre, the Norwegian Order of St. Olav, and the Order of the British Empire.

"A bachelor, Walker has had the single-minded devotion to the combat effectiveness and welfare of his troops. After the dismaying spectacle of some American prisoners of war in Korea succumbing to communism, he set his mind and energies to the task of trying to do something about the moral and spiritual stamina of our fighting men.

"What was General Walker's crime? A staff officer was commenting on a map which showed Communist countries in red and America and her allies in blue. The officer referred to the free world as anti-Red. 'That's defensive thinking,' Walker responded. 'We're probue.' Thus was the name given to General Walker's probue program for his 24th Infantry Division in Augsburg, Germany. Initiated in October 1960 the program was, in the general's own words, 'designed to develop an understanding of the American military and civil heritage, and the facts and objectives of those enemies who would destroy it.'

"The probue program brought to our soldiers in Germany the best education in American citizenship and anticommunism that could be found in print. Also, religion was stressed. The general's outline for the probue program stated: 'One of the basic areas of probue is the individual's relation to God. When the individual has the right relation with God he belongs to the family of God and, as such, conducts himself as a child of God.' The program undertook to raise soldier morale, and to stress discipline, law, and order.

"General Walker is well known for his desire to surround GI's under his command with a climate of morality and clean living. He and his probue program ran head on into conflict, therefore, with a filthy tabloid sold on European military bases, Overseas Weekly.

"The first and last pages of Overseas Weekly usually carry nude-type pictures. Many of the headlines are so lurid as to be unrepeatable. Lt. Gen. Charles Bolte, commanding general of the Army in Europe in 1953, banned Overseas Weekly as unfit for American servicemen. It was later reinstated when the chief owner and publisher, a Mrs. Marion von Rospach, agreed to 'clean it up,' a promise she never kept.

Overseas Weekly is represented by Pan American Publishers Representatives (PABCO). PABCO also represents Swank, an obscene publication which features work of notorious Communist frontiers. Parent publishing firm for Overseas Weekly is the International Media Co. (IMC). An IMC director, Gene Bernald, is a participating operator of a CIA-linked radio station in the Caribbean, radio SWAN, which aided in the failure of the recent Cuban invasion by mysterious failure to broadcast a prearranged signal to Cuban freedom fighters."

Remember, I am quoting from the Patrick Henry League. Since there has been so much erroneous information in the local morning paper relative to my statements on radio SWAN, let me repeat this statement from this publication from Yonkers, N.Y.:

"An IMC director, Gene Bernald, is a participating operator of a CIA-linked radio station in the Caribbean, radio SWAN, which aided in the failure of the recent Cuban invasion by mysterious failure to broadcast a prearranged signal to Cuban freedom fighters."

Now, I continue to quote from the Patrick Henry League:

"News editor of Overseas Weekly is John Dornberg who has undertaken a one-man anti-West Germany campaign with his disgusting book, 'Schizophrenic Germany.' An owner of Overseas Weekly, along with Marion von Rospach, is Harold Melahn. Melahn was a delegate to the Communist World Youth Festival in Prague in 1947.

When owner Rospach went to the Pentagon to appeal the 1953 suspension of *Overseas Weekly* by General Boite, she was accompanied by Samuel W. Yorty. Yorty has been identified under oath as a Communist by former Party Member Arthur J. Kent. In her writings, Marion von Rospach has betrayed herself as fond of Communist-front joiners and anti-Catholics.

"General Walker did not like what *Overseas Weekly* was trying to do to his troops and he said so. Further, he barred *Overseas Weekly* Reporter Siegfried Naujocks from all of the 24th Division's installations. Naujocks had been caught seeking a pipeline into the command headquarters. A native of Danzig, Poland, Naujocks is recorded as a former Nazi mercenary living in Germany and doing the bidding of *Overseas Weekly*. "As apparent retaliation against General Walker, the *Overseas Weekly* ran an attack by John Dornberg on April 16, 1961. The 'exposure' of the general and his probue program was repeated later on by (of course) the *New York Times*. And the scene was set for another witch hunt by the lunatic left.

"New stories accused General Walker of indoctrinating his troops with John Birch Society materials. This, because he made available 'The Life of John Birch,' (a Baptist missionary and soldier in China) an inspiring biography which makes no mention at all of the John Birch Society. The book was only one of many generally accepted works made available to men under Walker.

"When this charge against the general seemed to be falling through, new protests were made. Walker was 'reported to have said' that Mrs. Roosevelt is 'pink' and was 'quoted as being of the opinion' that America's TV and newspapers are greatly infiltrated . . . these vague accusations against General Walker were even further obscured by the *Overseas Weekly* style of innuendo.

"Finally, on June 12, 1961, Secretary of the Army, Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., a recent Kennedy appointment, announced that Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker was being officially admonished for having 'made derogatory remarks' and for 'participating in controversial activities.' The Pentagon announcement made no mention of *Overseas Weekly*, but an Army spokesman did say that the John Birch books were being barred from Army newsstands in Europe.

"Following the admonishment, the general was removed from orders assigning him to head the 8th U.S. Army Corps in Texas.

"On May 31, 1961, all members of the staff of the Special Warfare Office in the 24th Infantry Division in Germany were transferred to other duties and the probue program, left without any staff, was destroyed.

"On June 18, 1961, the *New York Times* quoted an unnamed Pentagon civilian official as stating that he hoped 'the extremists' in the Army would 'get the message' from what had just happened to General Walker and 'use good judgment in what they say and do.' End of quotes from a publication of the Patrick Henry League, Box 383, Main Post Office, Yonkers, N.Y.

Yes, my fellow Americans, your patriotic officers and men of our Armed Forces, our military, have gotten the message. They are afraid to stand up and speak out against the mortal enemy of our very American way of life, afraid to make any more talks to their fellow Americans alerting them to the nature of international communism. What on earth goes on here in the land of the free and the home of the brave? The matter of control of the military cannot be taken lightly. Do you realize the men and women throughout the land that are serving not only in our Regular Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force, but all Americans serving in any Reserve unit or National Guard are brought under the broad scope of gagging the military.

What better way for our domestic enemies to gain victories within our border than putting a clamp on the freedom of speech on those who are authorities as to the nature of communism?

However, the Communist Party's *Daily Worker*, in its August 13 issue, was not limiting its poisonous pen to the military. On page 5 there is a slanderous article directed at the anti-Communist efforts of our own Harding College, an outstanding Church of Christ school, located at Searcy, Ark. This article entitled, "Poisonous Web Spun from Arkansas Town" is filled with abuses and untruths. A review of such articles is adequate demonstration that no issue of civilian control of the military is really and truly involved. Military leaders have shown no evidence of violating their oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. But, alas, a few notable examples of individuals high in official and political circles have recommended a revision of that greatest of all legal instruments, the Constitution of the United States. I join with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the Honorable STROM THURMOND, in carrying the message throughout the land that we must not allow the real purpose of the anti-anti-Communist campaign to be camouflaged behind a smoke-screen of the question of civilian control over the military. Instead, we should be thankful for military men of courage who are Godly men, men of integrity and the determination to fight the psychological war for the minds and hearts of men as well as fighting the war for materialism. The Communists fear an upsurge of patriotism in America more than anything else today. What the Commies really fear is a widespread understanding by the American people, both civilian and military, of the nature of communism and the tactics used by them to infiltrate every facet of our lives, our religions, our schools, our clubs, and our homes. When all Americans reassert once again the principles laid down by our Founding Fathers, the system of less government and more freedom of speech and more freedom of enterprise, a tremendous wave of patriotism to our American Republic will mean the complete destruction and stamping out in our land of the pre-cancerous socialism which results in a totalitarian atheistic state.

My fellow Americans, let our prayers be this day, God give America a new breath of patriotism.

Tribute to Hon. Eugene Keogh

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my good friend, EUGENE KEOGH. GENE has been my next-door neighbor in the New House Office Building for several years. I know of no better way to judge a person than to live beside him, and I could want for no better neighbor. That our staffs also have had a pleasant association is, I believe, a reflection of the friendship GENE and I have enjoyed over the years. He is an able legislator and has been helpful to me on many occasions when I have con-

sulted with him about legislative matters that I have had before his committee. I extend to him warm good wishes for continued good health and happiness.

Some Catholic Opinion on Disarmament—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the President's bill to create a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security has been sponsored by more Members than any other specific bill in this session of Congress. With this considerable support, I am hopeful that the bill will pass before the recess and before debates on disarmament at the U.N. this fall.

As many know, backing for this legislation has come from all parts and segments of the United States. President Eisenhower has joined leading Republican and Democratic statesmen from Defense, State, and other departments in support of this bill to create a research and negotiating agency for disarmament.

Many religious bodies have also spoken out on this subject. As the following item from the August 10 Catholic Messenger indicates, the Catholic Association for Peace, and the able work of the association's vice president and director of the Peace Research Center, Father Edward A. Conway, S.J., have demonstrated the power and depth of religious feeling for a new approach to peace and security:

[From the Catholic Messenger, Davenport, Iowa, August 10, 1961]

CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, JEWS ASKED TO
BACK DISARMAMENT

RENSSELAER, IND.—Catholics, Jews, and Protestants were urged here Tuesday to unite in support of the administration's proposals for a U.S. Disarmament Agency.

The call for prompt and united action in behalf of bills now before Congress was voiced at the Young Christian Workers' National Study Week by Father Edward A. Conway, S.J., director of the Peace Research Center at Creighton University, Omaha.

He reminded the 500 delegates meeting at St. Joseph's College that the official agencies of the three faiths had issued a joint declaration calling for progressive reciprocal disarmament in 1953.

"Today, for the first time since their precedent-setting act of interfaith cooperation," he said, "our Government shows its willingness to devote the resources required for adequate arms control planning. If the churches are still interested, now is the time for strong cooperative support of the pending legislation."

Noting with warm approval that Catholics had recently joined Jews and Protestants in united support for foreign aid and immigration measures, Father Conway asserted cooperative support of the Peace Agency bills was equally important.

"In fact," he said, "unless this runaway arms race is arrested within the next several

years, there may be no nations to aid nor immigrants to welcome."

In reply to doubts about the possibility of disarmament in the present conditions of tension, Father Conway argued that plans must be ready for presentation in saner times. "After the contestants over Berlin have teetered on the brink of thermonuclear hell for a couple of months, they may come to their senses and decide that one such balancing act is enough," he predicted.

Father Conway closed his address with an appeal and a warning: "It will take many months to produce a thoroughly safe and scientifically and politically feasible arms control program; and, therefore, it is absolutely imperative that this agency be approved in this session of Congress."

"Both officially and privately, the religious groups of this country should press the Congress to complete action before it adjourns. The reasons for cooperative action are megatons more important than they were 18 years ago."

Overwhelming Superiority of Combination Transmission Proposal Wins Support of Upper Colorado River Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of the resolution from the Upper Colorado River Commission dated September 1, 1961, endorsing the proposal of the utility companies for transmitting power from the Colorado River storage project. This Commission, representing the four Upper Basin States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming was established by interstate compact, authorized and ratified by Congress in 1949 to supervise the regulation, conservation, and utilization of the waters of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

This commission is not concerned with the public versus private power issues involved in the controversy but only with the best interests of the project which both the Congress and the commission recognize as the reclamation or irrigation features. The commission's endorsement of the utilities' transmission proposal represents the official position of the four sovereign States and is adequate demonstration of the overwhelming superiority of the combination system.

If the Western States are to continue to receive funds from taxpayers of the East and Midwest to develop the lands of their area, they should be aware of the wastefulness of Federal funds on projects such as the public power advocates favor under the guise of reclamation.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee I am naturally very concerned with unnecessary spending and wish to call the following to the attention of my colleagues:

Denver, Colo., September 4, 1961.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

We understand that very soon House Appropriation Committee will be considering

Bureau of Reclamation appropriation to construct an all-Federal transmission system to bring hydroelectric energy from the Colorado River storage project to the preference users of the area.

Within hours the Upper Colorado River Commission has obtained a concession from five investor-owned utilities that they stand ready to negotiate a firm contract with the Bureau of Reclamation to deliver hydroelectric energy from the Colorado River storage project to preference users at competitive wheeling rates which we believe are distinctly advantageous to the Colorado River Basin.

In the last minute developments Mr. Ival Goslin, chief engineer and executive secretary of the Upper Colorado River Commission, will hand you a copy of the unanimous endorsement by the Upper Colorado River Commission of the revised combination transmission system sponsored by the utilities. The members of this commission are Gov. George Clyde, Utah; John Bliss, New Mexico; Earl Lloyd, Wyoming; and former Gov. Ed Johnson, Colorado.

If combination system is approved by Congress funds requested by Bureau of Reclamation could be reduced by approximately \$135 million for transmission facilities without decreasing services or increasing delivery costs to preference users. Most respectfully we urge favorable action on our recommendations.

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Colorado River Commissioners.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION,
Salt Lake City, Utah, September 2, 1961.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MICHEL: After having received assurances from the five investor-owned electric utilities of the Upper Colorado River Basin area that the utilities will reduce their charges for transmitting electrical energy to preference consumers after the utilities' capital investments in transmission facilities used for wheeling have been amortized, or after the initial 50-year period of wheeling, whichever is earlier, to actual costs of ad valorem taxes and operation, maintenance and replacement, the Upper Colorado River Commission adopted the enclosed resolution endorsing the combination transmission system proposed by the investor-owned utilities for transmitting electrical energy to be generated by the Colorado River storage project.

The resolution was adopted by the commission at a special meeting on September 1, 1961.

Sincerely yours,

IVAL V. GOSLIN,
Chief Engineer and Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION

Whereas the Congress exercises the policymaking power of the United States; and

Whereas Congress authorized and ratified an interstate compact among the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming which created a commission representing Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming to supervise the regulation, conservation and utilization of the waters of the Upper Colorado River Basin; and

Whereas the legislature of each of said five States ratified said Upper Colorado River Basin compact; and

Whereas the chairman of said commission is appointed by the President of the United States; and

Whereas the commissioners are appointed by the Governors of the said four States—each Governor naming one commissioner to serve at his pleasure; and

Whereas the utilization of the waters apportioned by said compact for the generation of hydroelectric energy is subser-

vient to the use and consumption of such waters for agricultural and domestic purposes; and

Whereas the regulation, conservation and utilization of the waters of the said basin requires the construction of both storage projects and participating projects; and

Whereas this development is implemented by the enactment of Public Law 485, 84th Congress, an act authorizing the Colorado River storage project and participating projects; and

Whereas said projects will generate electric energy which will be marketed; and

Whereas the revenues from such marketing must repay the construction costs of said storage projects including electric facilities and a portion of the construction costs of said participating projects; and

Whereas the early development of the participating projects is of great importance to the progress and welfare of the upper basin States; and

Whereas at the hearings of the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees in 1954 and 1955 on the authorization for the construction of said Colorado River storage project and participating projects, the investor-owned electric utilities offered to wheel storage project power to preference users over their transmission systems; and

Whereas the Congress in House Report No. 1087, 84th Congress, 1st session, expressed favorable interest in these proposals and stated at page 17: "The Department of the Interior advised the committee that it was sympathetic to the private companies' proposal and indicated that the suggestions would be given studied consideration if the project were authorized. Therefore, the committee expects the proposal by the private power companies for cooperation in the development to be carefully considered by the Department of the Interior and the electric power and energy of the project to be marketed, so far as possible, through the facilities of the electric utilities operating in the area, provided, of course, that the power preference laws are complied with and project repayment and consumer power rates are not adversely affected"; and

Whereas under the provisions of law certain parties are entitled to a preference for the purchase of project electric energy at the price established by the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas in the Upper Colorado River Basin investor-owned and Federal transmission lines serve both preference and private users; and

Whereas the investor-owned utilities have proposed a combination transmission system with certain lines to be constructed and operated by the Federal Government and the remaining lines to be provided by the investor-owned utilities with wheeling service for Colorado River storage project energy over such lines to specified load centers; and

Whereas according to recent tables submitted by the Bureau of Reclamation changing from the yardstick to the modified system thereby increasing the number of delivery points from 15 to 24, the irrigation assistance to States has been reduced approximately \$50 million; and

Whereas the controversy over the construction of transmission lines has been exceedingly detrimental to reclamation and must be resolved quickly on merit alone; and

Whereas the Upper Colorado River Commission believes that the investor-owned utilities after their capital investments in wheeling facilities have been amortized should adjust their wheeling charges to cover only ad valorem taxes on such transmission facilities, plus operation, maintenance, and replacement costs actually incurred; and

Whereas such reduced wheeling charges would substantially increase the revenues available for the basin fund as compared with the originally proposed "combination" system; and,

Whereas the Upper Colorado River Commission has the direct responsibility to protect the adequacy and integrity of said basin fund above other considerations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Upper Colorado River Commission, having obtained from the investor-owned utilities firm assurance that they will enter into agreements with the Bureau of Reclamation for bona fide wheeling contracts in which the utilities will limit their wheeling charges after their capital investments in said transmission facilities have been amortized or after the initial 50-year period, whichever is the earlier, to cover only actual ad valorem taxes and actual operation, maintenance, and replacement costs on transmission facilities associated with such wheeling contracts, endorses the combination proposal of the investor-owned utilities, provided that the Congress determines that under such proposal the project repayment and consumer power rates are not adversely affected when compared with other methods of energy transmission; and, be it further

Resolved, That the commission advise the Congress of this endorsement and that the chief engineer and secretary of the commission is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to members of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress and to other interested parties.

I, Ival V. Goslin, chief engineer and secretary of the Upper Colorado River Commission, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was duly passed and approved by the Upper Colorado River Commission at a regularly called meeting of said commission held at Denver, Colo., on the 1st day of September 1961.

Witness my hand this 1st day of September 1961.

IVAL V. GOSLIN,
Chief Engineer and Secretary.

Address by Hon. Theodore R. McKeldin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest traditions of Maryland is the custom of conducting an annual Sunday school picnic in many local communities. These gatherings bring together families and congregations and serve not only as homecomings, but also as reminders of the values of church and home which have been so important in the formation of our national character.

On September 2, it was my privilege to attend the Mountindale Union Sunday School Picnic and I wish to congratulate Mr. Gordon F. Palmer, superintendent of the Sunday school and all his committee for their continuing support of this splendid American custom.

The principal speaker on Saturday was the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin whose service to his fellow citizens as mayor of Baltimore and Governor of Maryland are too well known to require further mention. Mr. McKeldin's address is so timely that I am appending it for the benefit of the Members of this House.

REMARKS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, MOUNTINDALE UNION SUNDAY SCHOOL PICNIC—78TH ANNUAL—FREDERICK COUNTY, MD., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1961

On Monday—the first Monday in September—we will observe a national holiday, and, by custom and by law, pay tribute to the working men and women of America. While in this country nearly all of us are workers, and all will share in the tribute, the day is particularly dedicated to those of the mass production industries and related enterprises in which was discovered and proven, many years ago, the wisdom and even the necessity of organization among the employees and, by collective bargaining, to give them a united voice in dealing with those who employed them.

On Monday, we will honor the memories of the great leaders of the past—like Samuel Gompers, John Mitchell and Peter McGuire, who founded the celebration of Labor Day—men who directed and guided the organization of labor and abolished the sweatshops, eliminated the exploitation of children in factories, and raised the men in the mills, the mines, and other industrial enterprises from stages of slavery to degrees of independence and decency in their livelihood.

When one sees today the great and lucrative market for all the goods of our production and commerce that exists in labor's massive ranks, one wonders how the giants of industrial management ever could have been so blind as to deny to so many people the means to buy and the time to use and enjoy the fruits of their own and their fellows' labor. I could go on to speak at great length of the past contributions of labor, but rather, for this Labor Day, I should like to say a few words concerning conditions that threaten the progress of the workingman and the economic welfare of our country, and make a few suggestions for Maryland.

Nationally, the figures for July show 5,140,000 unemployed—more than a million out of work for at least 6 months. Another 1,300,000 nonfarm workers are struggling for an existence for themselves and their families in part-time jobs because they cannot obtain steady full-time work. Here in Maryland there are 71,400 unemployed, and I might add that during the month of July total employment dropped by 12,499.

Who are the unemployed? Almost all the workers in this unfortunate category are men over 45 years of age, nonwhite, and unskilled laborers. It is highly doubtful in the future if many of these workers will be given employment because they lack the education and skill needed to fill most of the jobs that will be created as automation increases.

Automation is the main threat to full employment today. However, no man in his right senses would call for the abolishment of automation. The development and production of the great machine are part of the American system—part of our progress—the proof of our inventive genius. And that genius had and continues to have its own great role in the development of the American economy.

The problem of automation and its contribution to the unemployment statistics is one that Government cannot ignore. It will not readily cure itself. The Congress of the United States has been studying the matter. Just last month, the Senate passed Senate bill 1991 which would provide for the training and retraining of many workers in new skills. While this bill would call for the cooperation of State vocational educational agencies and other available training agencies, it would be financed for the first 2 years of its operation by the Federal Government—then on a 50-50 matching fund basis with the participating States.

It is a step in the right direction. I hope that the House of Representatives will enact it promptly. I know that the President will sign it because the bill originated in the administration. In the event of its enactment, the State of Maryland should lose no time in implementing it.

There are those who feel that government should not enter into such programs. In fact, there are persons who take the attitude that a 4-percent unemployment rate is tolerable in our economy. I do not subscribe to these views. Moreover, I feel that only full employment of all those willing and able to work is the answer to unemployment, and government—I mean government at all levels—has a direct interest in seeking this goal. This principle was fully approved by Congress in its declaration of policy in the Employment Act of 1946.

What can we do here in Maryland to increase employment and to strive for the goal of full employment?

As I stated earlier we can begin studying a training and a retraining program which can be quickly implemented and expanded in the event of the enactment of Senate bill 1991.

We need a more adequate program developed to provide assistance to long-term, hard-core unemployed. We should strengthen our State guidance and counseling services.

Acceleration of our building program, both private and public, should be actively encouraged.

We should attract new industries to Maryland. Of course, the prime responsibility rests with local industries and local citizens, including the chamber of commerce and various civic groups. However, the State could well consider the need of implementing the program of the Maryland Economic Development Commission to provide for financial assistance for firms wishing to locate here. Approval, however, must be based on local conditions, sound contracts, and the number of new jobs created, but above all, the inability of the community to go it alone.

State government can and should cooperate, both in directing inquiries about site locations to those communities where unemployment is high and in the performance of needed services within the realm of State government—just as we did some years ago when we cut yards of red tape to provide an essential road into the site of a large glass plant for Cumberland.

Maryland long has been active in inducing employers to employ handicapped persons, and with considerable success. Much remains to be done. The campaign is a continuing one that cannot rest.

And in much the same manner we should strengthen our program against the foolishness of those employers who need men and women in their business and industries but refuse to hire many of those who apply because they have reached a certain age. This is utter waste and nonsense.

It may well be time to review our tax laws to determine if a revision is advisable to encourage employment and further capital investment in Maryland.

Most important we should open our doors of opportunity for all our people. In this way each can make his full contribution to our progress and live in self-respect. Individual merit of each person should be the sole judgment by which employees are hired.

Unemployment is a big problem but one that can be solved—and one that requires the attention and the action of governments and people from now on. Economists contend that there always will be some unemployment and maybe they are right—but we cannot escape it as Gospel. We must strive for perfection—for the happiness and pros-

perity of our whole people. People and jobs create markets for all consumer goods.

As Governor of Maryland and as mayor of Baltimore, I supported progress for the workingman and advocated his just causes. Making Maryland an attractive State to work and invest in is the best insurance for our continued economic growth. So, on this Labor Day of 1961 we salute the 73 million working people of America and express our appreciation for their contribution to our progress, security, and defense.

Pharmacies: The Health Service Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, throughout this entire session of the Congress, there has been a constant concern over the practice of the healing arts of the United States. In Louis C. Zopf, dean of the college of pharmacy at the State University of Iowa, has an eminent and well qualified spokesman who, in the August issue of the Iowa Pharmacist has contributed significantly to current discussion of pending legislation.

I herewith submit this article and commend it to the consideration of all thoughtful citizens.

PHARMACIES: THE HEALTH SERVICE STATIONS
(By Louis C. Zopf)

All pharmacists must take an active part in the defense of pharmacy as a profession. The people of the community have every reason to expect a lucid discussion by a professional person, regarding legislative proposals and government regulations which affect the health of the Nation. Pharmacies are the health service stations of America.

Chain Store Age reports 260 new products released in the first 6 months of 1961. The biggest breakthrough, according to this journal, was the announcement of the oral contraceptive products, with other major developments being the release of potent anti-inflammatory steroids, several new psychotropics, and an important breakthrough in the development of measles vaccine. They list 24 basic discoveries during this period of time. As pharmacists we frequently question the apparent duplicity in drug products, but let us remember that patient response is an unpredictable variable. Though similarity may exist in therapeutic agents; slight modifications, chemically or pharmaceutically, do cause a variance in biological response in certain cases.

Mr. and Mrs. Public read about new drugs at almost the same time they are released to the health professions. The individual's next contact with the new drug is during an illness, when he is confronted with the economics of the product. In the interim, and particularly following a satisfactory therapeutic response, the value of a new drug is most conveniently weighed by its cost.

Pharmacists must give more time to explaining the true value of continuous pharmaceutical research. Mr. Walter A. Munns, president of Smith Kline and French Laboratories, has pointed out that the current Kefauver-Celler bill proposes to change the wording of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act by adding the words: "efficacy" and "efficacious" where the words "safety" and

"safe" now appear. On the surface, such a change in the act would merely legally require drug companies to continue doing what they are actually doing now; that is, to present clinical evidence showing that a drug is safe and effective in treating a specific condition. The new provision would not of itself change the current administrative practice of the FDA. On the other hand, it is a well known fact of government administration that statutory requirements are often extended, by the device of "administrative practice" to acquire more than the language of a bill specifically stipulates. Just as "safety" has been interpreted to include "efficacy" under the present act, "efficacy" may be extended to include the concept of "comparative efficiency." Spokesmen have been testifying that it is their belief that the drug companies should be required to prove a new product more effective than an already marketed product. Others have complained about duplication of products. Under the bill the Commissioner of Patents would be given the power to turn down a patent application unless the manufacturer can prove to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that a given molecular modification or combination has a significantly greater therapeutic effect than products already on the market.

The concept of a comparative efficacy of drugs certainly cannot be made by non-professional people when professionally trained individuals admit that they are unable to agree on values of a drug's therapeutic merit. How then can we expect advancement of pharmaceutical product development when the control of therapeutic agents is based on the proof that a new agent has demonstrable superiority to products already on the market? Dr. Modell, in "Drugs of Choice," states: "Many drugs have more than one action and more than one sphere of clinical application. In each of these, the same drug may be relatively more or less effective, more or less dangerous, more or less important . . . relative utility may vary with the clinical application. . . . As in the case of the phenothiazine compounds which were recently introduced only for their antihistamine action, new therapeutic uses are being continually proposed."

Where would we have been, if for example, digitalis had been discarded when it was used solely as an infusion for its diuretic effect? The Veratrum Alkaloids were discarded many years ago but through consistent, scientifically controlled investigation by many workers, they now appear as accepted antihypertensive agents. Drugs originally introduced for the treatment of one condition frequently find their greatest value in the treatment of some other disease. Hormones, antibiotics, and tranquilizers are examples of drugs with tremendous potential therapeutic values. They are not specifically designed for the treatment of only one type of disease or condition and they therefore properly appear as modified and variable dosage forms. The value of certain of these drugs has surpassed the initial purpose of their acceptance and it is reasonable to believe that many new uses may still appear for these therapeutic families. There is much more to liberty of developing a new drug product than some lay groups like to believe. They are encouraged to think that development of new drug products is a sales gimmick.

We have recently been introduced to an oncolytic drug whose source is from the periwinkle. This drug, defined as an alkaloid, is said to have definite value in the treatment of Hodgkins disease and some hope that it may have definite value in the treatment of malignant neoplastic conditions. The introduction of this new agent by one of our leading pharmaceutical houses will encourage all pharmaceutical research personnel to reconsider and reevaluate prod-

ucts of similar design. Certainly this represents the challenge of another success which will be of benefit to the health of all. Some shelfworn materials may possess the needed variable to make them outstanding agents in the fight against cancer. Certainly our natural resources are capable of yielding many important therapeutic products. When these are developed they may rightfully and properly lead to the development of valuable synthetic products. The motivation for pharmaceutical research can be smothered if the concept of "comparative efficiency" becomes a reality.

Pharmacists are completely articulate, therefore, let each of us explain the values of pharmacy's contributions to the public health. Our obligation currently is magnified. Let us do our share.

A Constituent's View of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I received this letter from Mrs. H. G. Pedersen, of Pewaukee, Wis. It was originally sent to the Waukesha Daily Freeman and discusses a previous letter from a Mr. Hunt. I think others may agree with me that this is a most straightforward and thoughtful expression of opinion on the subject of foreign aid:

PEWAUKEE, WISC., August 27 1961.

To the FREEMAN (WAUKESHA DAILY FREEMAN):

In regard to the present foreign aid bill, the question has been raised, "Can we afford it?" That depends, I suppose, upon what we mean by "afford." We are the richest country in the world and enjoy the highest standard of living. Many people in this same world are literally starving to death or foraging in garbage heaps to stay alive. Even if it means raising taxes which in turn might mean our having to go without some of the luxuries we now enjoy, I would hope that we could afford it.

As to the reason for foreign aid given by Mr. Hunt (Freeman, August 26): "To me foreign aid means funds to effectively aid people interested in their own struggle to effectively oppose communism where it can be appraised of some tangible value to the United States." I prefer President Kennedy's reasoning. " . . . we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right." The fact that we hope the present aid bill will meet a desperate need of our own (self-preservation) is a fortunate coincidence.

What alternative is offered by those who wish to restrict or eliminate foreign aid? I fail to see any except to watch as one country after another revolts and establishes a Communist regime. Then one day when we inevitably stand alone we will most certainly lose our precious wealth—and count it the least of what we lose. President Kennedy also said, "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

Because our aid has sometimes taken a wrong direction in the past, this should not serve as a justification for not granting the new administration its current request. Our aid is now to be directed to countries willing

to help themselves which means land and tax reform on their part and economic aid and technical assistance on ours. Past failures have often been the result of supporting extreme right-wing governments (vocally anti-Communist, but unwilling to make necessary reforms) and has taken the form of military aid. As Vice President JOHNSON said, "You will have to look a long time before you find people willing to fight to defend poverty and ignorance."

As for the long-term borrowing authority, it is my understanding that once granted it would be up to Congress to take the initiative to cancel it. This could be done then if the program does not prove successful. Isn't this correct?

"Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." Well?

Very truly yours,

JO ANN PEDERSEN,
Mrs. H. G. Pedersen.

Will the United States Never Learn?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are asking the question: When will the Government of the United States clamp down on the export of vital and essential defense shipments to the Soviet Union and its satellites? An editorial published by the Paragould Daily Press under date of August 22 is recommended reading for every Member of the Congress.

A few days ago it was my privilege to hear the discussion before the House Rules Committee of a resolution introduced by Representative A. PAUL KITCHIN, of North Carolina, which would create a select committee to make a thorough investigation of shipments of critical materials to the Soviet Union and the Iron Curtain countries. The Rules Committee approved the resolution and it is now before the House for action. I hope that the Kitchin resolution will be speedily approved and the work of this probe started with a minimum of delay.

The Paragould Daily Press editorial follows:

WILL THE UNITED STATES NEVER LEARN?

Will we never learn? Does U.S. stand for Uncle Simpleton?

A Commerce Department report, released this week, shows an increase of more than 800 percent in the volume of American goods licensed for shipment to Communist countries—in the 3 weeks following President Kennedy's address to the Nation on Berlin.

In the 3 weeks preceding the President's address (July 25), the Department licensed the shipment of \$750,195 in American goods to the Soviet Union and her European satellites.

In the 3 succeeding weeks, the Department authorized the shipment of \$6,278,566 to Nikita Khrushchev and his Communist cohorts.

Broken down, the authorizations included: \$2,500,000 of rail equipment for Bulgaria; \$1,700,000 of synthetic rubber for Russia, Poland, Hungary, and Rumania; \$107,000

of industrial instruments for Russia, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; \$95,000 of coal tar products for Hungary and Czechoslovakia; \$38,000 of carbon black for Czechoslovakia; \$35,000 of industrial and specialty chemicals for Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany; \$23,000 of pipe valves for Russia and Poland.

Now here's the clincher. The Commerce Department says that none of these proposed shipments will endanger national security. Officials also point out that export regulations prohibit shipments to Iron Curtain countries of goods calculated to increase their warmaking potential.

Humbly. Anything that helps the general economy of the Communist bloc—and don't say the above authorizations will not—helps and abets the Soviet Union's warmaking potential. When Khrushchev and company can purchase "staples" from old, gullible Uncle Sam, they can increase their efforts to turn out the horrors of war and to the space race.

Isn't it about time we lowered the boom on these "patriotic businessmen" who rate the dollar above their country's welfare? And, isn't it also time for the Federal Government to wade into something that is their "business" for a change?

Doing business with the Soviet bloc is one heck of a way to fight communism and all it stands for.

Address by President Eisenhower at Rededication of Washington Confederate Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, as the Civil War Centennial commemoration continues there will be many ceremonies in different parts of the country, but none will have a deeper significance for the past and the present than the events which took place in Hagerstown Md., on Sunday, September 3. On that occasion the Civil War Centennial Commission, through its executive secretary Karl Betts, awarded its gold medal to General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower who served as honorary chairman of the Commission while President of the United States. President Eisenhower then participated in rededication of the Washington Confederate Cemetery where 2,500 unknown southern soldiers lie buried in a common grave.

By recalling to mind the difficult, demanding, dangerous days of the 1860's in the equally difficult, demanding, dangerous days of the 1960's we are further inspired to summon up the courage and fortitude which will be necessary for the survival of the Union and the continued existence of a great republic conceived in liberty.

President Eisenhower expressed the spirit of the day forcefully and eloquently. It is my privilege to append his speech for the benefit of the Congress and the country:

A full century has passed since our Nation underwent, in bitter and prolonged Civil War, a grave threat to her existence.

Irreconcilable differences in the convictions of a divided citizenry put to the test of arms the asserted right of any State to withdraw from the Union, as opposed to the belief of others who held that we are—always have been—and must ever be, one Nation, indivisible.

Under this earth, where we now stand, lie men, who, in that war, gave their lives in defense of the convictions they held to be right.

In the background of the tragic conflict was another issue old as history—the struggle for human dignity in all places, in all climes, in all ages.

The war, fought with courage and tenacity, and ending only when one side reached utter exhaustion, settled the political issue in favor of national unity; while the cause of human dignity in the world was advanced still another step in its long and tortuous progress toward fulfillment.

As we meet today to pay tribute to the gallant fallen of that conflict we sense, with all our faculties, that our Nation, now united, is living through another dangerous trial of strength which, though not accompanied by the clash of arms, is waged on a global scale.

On the one side are those who, seeking world domination, hold that man is a soulless creature born to serve, without choice, the decrees of an all-powerful state and, on the other, those who see man as created in the image of his Maker, guaranteed the blessings of liberty and master of the government under which he lives.

The threat strikes at the very foundations of our Nation—at all the values that free men cherish.

Dedicated, without reservation, to the advancement of our faith in man's Divine origin, we thank these men, now almost a 100 years in their graves, for the inspiration they—and their equally dedicated opponents in that war—have given us in their shining example of courage, endurance and fidelity.

May we, always, in the long and bitter contest stretching out before us, feel our convictions as deeply—and so faithfully sustain them—as they.

Our salute to them—our prayer for them and for our Nation—is this: "May you rest well in this place, and may your sons and daughters ever be the proud possessors of, and live in, the strength of conviction, the courage of the selflessness that you so richly displayed."

Hon. Eugene Keogh

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as we draw to the end of a busy session, there will continue to be issues on which our votes will be split or perhaps not cast. On the subject under discussion, however, there will be no dissenters nor abstainers. For on both sides of the aisle there is nothing but a single resolve: That today be as happy and memorable as any other single day in his good and distinguished life for our beloved and respected colleague: **GENE KEOGH**.

There is much I could say but let me say only that this is a man amongst us whose friendship I cherish, whose wisdom I respect, whose courage I salute, whose manner I admire.

Happy birthday, GENE. May God bless you and your family and keep you well to serve as you have served.

Address by Hon. John Tower, of Texas,
Brookings, S. Dak., August 27, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of the Honorable JOHN TOWER, a junior Senator from the State of Texas, given at the picnic during the Young Republican convention in Brookings, S. Dak., Sunday, August 27.

I am certain that the remarks, the thought and the philosophy of Senator TOWER will be of special interest not only to every conservative, but to every Member of Congress:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN TOWER, OF TEXAS

Fellow Republicans, discerning Democrats, fellow Americans, it's a great privilege and pleasure for me to be in South Dakota, particularly in these exciting days when we are celebrating the centennial of the Dakota Territory. I've had the opportunity to participate in some of the festivities, and I must say that you Dakotans are better than Texans in extending warm hospitality, and I am deeply grateful to you, and I'm enjoying myself immensely here.

We Republicans sometimes have been likened unto a family that I knew of in east Texas. Down in east Texas we have quite a lot of sharecroppers—they live in little shacks on little patches of land, and the whole family sleeps together. One night outside one of the little shacks the old hound dog was just a howlin' and howlin'. Indoors the family was asleep on the pallet, and papa woke up and rolled over and said, "Mama, go out thar and see what is wrong with the old hound dog. I would go myself, but I'm just too tired to move." Mama rolls over and shakes the son. "Son, get up and go out thar and see what is wrong with the old hound dog. I would go myself, but I'm just too tired to move." He rolls over and shakes his sister. He says, "Sister, go out thar and see what's wrong with the old hound dog. I would go myself, but I'm too tired to move." Sister rolls over to little brother, and says, "Little brother, go out thar and see what's wrong with that hound dog. I would go myself, but I'm just too tired to move." Little brother rolls over and there wasn't anybody else there, so he had to go outdoors to see what was wrong with the dog. Pretty soon he came back in the house and his daddy said, "Son, just what was wrong with the old hound dog?" And he said, "Well, daddy, he was a settin' on a cacklebur and he was just too tired to move."

But, I don't think this is characteristic of the Republican Party any more and of Republicans on the grassroots level generally because we have come to realize that instead of sitting around and griping about what is going on in Washington, it is high time we did something about it.

There is a great resurgence of conservative feeling in the United States today, and if we Republicans don't win some elections next year, it's our own fault. Now, next year's elections are elections that not only

Republicans but discerning Democrats have a stake in. I know that there are a number of Democrats who appreciate America's fundamental institutions, who recognize our basic strengths as free people, who espouse the principles of Thomas Jefferson, who believe that that government is best that governs least; and I know that there are a lot of dissatisfied Democrats today. Maybe all the dissatisfied Democrats have already seen the light and joined the Republican Party in South Dakota; they're still in the process of enlightenment in Texas. It may take a little time, but eventually we have high hopes. Actually, they are not leaving the Democrat Party, the Democrat Party has left them; and the Democrat Party as presently led nationally does not espouse the traditional principles of that once great party—the party of Jefferson, the man who believed that the people should have the responsibility of governing themselves—because the present administration and the present leadership of the national Democrat Party has the idea that the people should not have the responsibility for governing themselves, that the people are too stupid to make their own decisions.

The men who now surround the President—his covey of advisers for whom he has denuded the faculty of Harvard University—are men who have made some statements that if implemented into the law and into public policy, will mean the end, I believe, ultimately of self-government as you and I know it. They hold, for example, that the people have too much money and that they spend it foolishly. They spend it on automobiles, TV sets, boats, and personal pleasure—"personal indulgence," as Mr. Kennedy calls it. I don't know where he dreamed up that phrase—I guess it was while he was on his yacht off Hyannis Port. So, since we're so stupid and can't exercise freedom of choice wisely, they're going to take our money away from us and spend it in a manner that the Harvard professors know is best for us. As a matter of fact, one of them—Mr. Schlesinger—says, with ecstasy in his eyes, "There are new potential sources of taxation we haven't even explored yet." Heaven help us. I thought they had just about gotten to us every way they can, but apparently they're trying to figure out some new ways.

You ought to sit up there in the Senate of the United States day after day and watch how we're spending your money—just like it's going out of style, and at the rate they're spending it, there won't be any to be in style after a while.

Now, I personally believe that the American people do have the confidence to make their own decisions. The essence of self-government, the essence of liberty is freedom of choice. We are allowed to make our own decisions, and freedom of choice should be limited by laws and regulations and rules only to the extent necessary to preserve order in the society, to protect us in the enjoyment of our rights as individuals, and to provide for the national defense. And these are the only limitations that it should have.

Our people, I think, over a period of years have been reduced to a state of dependency on the National Government to the extent that many of them think that it is the function of the Government to afford everybody a minimum standard of living. Now, my friends, you can't have cradle-to-the-grave security and freedom of choice—you've got to choose between them, because whenever you abdicate your responsibility for the preservation of your own welfare to the National Government, it may take a load off your back, but it also takes away from you freedom of choice and individual liberty, and remember that.

Think about what is happening to the Republic. The more the Government takes away from you and spends, the less freedom of choice you have. You know there is no

democracy like the democracy at the marketplace. Here is some Federal currency. This bill represents a great number of things to a great number of people. It may represent groceries or automobiles or a new television set or some personal security. The one thing else that it represents is freedom of choice. There is no democracy like the democracy at the marketplace because this dollar bill is in effect a ballot. You take it into the marketplace, you place it on the counter, and in so doing, you are voting for goods and services that American industry produces for you. Now, the more of this that the Government takes away from you, the less freedom of choice you have, the less democracy there is.

The Communists advocate a system in which the state will wither away eventually. They say, "We won't use currency anymore, we won't use money. This is certainly an instrumentality of capitalism." And the Communists feel that some day they'll be able to get rid of it. But, of course, when that day comes, if it comes, all the people who live in such a society will only be cogs in a machine. The only incentive they will have to produce is some vague thing called the good of society.

We are individuals, and because we have for centuries adhered to the Christian ethical system, we believe that as individuals we have a great deal of value and worth, and we believe that as individuals we should make as much individual progress as we can; but we cannot hope to achieve anything, we cannot hope to make progress unless we have a climate of liberty. I may be a common man, and I dislike that term "common man," but I want to preserve the type of system that will allow me, however common I am, to aspire to be better.

The fact that a man has been allowed to own property and to develop it, to better himself economically, to better his community and business steadiness—it has been the genius and the dynamic behind the very great growth of our America, it has not come as a result of a bunch of New Frontiersmen taking our money away from us and spending it for us.

Now, for the most part, I oppose virtually all of the domestic programs of the New Frontier. The liberals always say to me, "Well, Tower, you oppose everything, what are you for?" I will tell you what I am for. I am for the preservation of the American Constitution and political system. I am for the preservation of the capitalist economy. I am for the preservation of the recognition that every individual has his worth. I am for freedom of choice and freedom of association. I am for personal progress. And, because I am for these things, I must necessarily oppose that which I know to be destructive of these things. This is no more a negative approach than that of the man who stops a runaway horse that threatens to trample down your children in the streets.

I think we can take pride in opposing those things which go against the American tradition. I am a conservative, I wear the badge of conservatism proudly, I will make no apologies for it. I am a conservative not because I am a stick-in-the-mud, not because I am antiquated in my ideas, not because I resist progress; quite to the contrary, I am a conservative because I recognize the great progress that our people have made historically, I should like for us to continue to make progress, I believe that conservatism is synonymous with progress because it seeks to preserve those things that history and experience have proven will make us progress as a people.

Now, the liberals very sneeringly call us cave men and Neanderthals, and they say that BARRY GOLDWATER is so good looking that he ought to be in the movies; namely, 18th Century Fox. This, of course, is dirty pool. It is misrepresentation of the worst

type, because it paints an image of conservatism that is completely false.

You think BARRY GOLDWATER is not a progressive? This guy flies jet airplanes—he's a product of the jet age. Have you ever been inside his automobile? It takes a graduate engineer to operate the thing—it's got more gadgets in it than you can shake a stick at. Here is a man who is vitally interested in new things, and he knows that a free and dynamic people will continue to afford worthwhile change and a better life for us all.

I've been accused of being dragged, kicking and screaming, into the 20th century. As somebody said, Tower is slightly to the right of McKinley and slightly to the left of Alfred the Great. But it is the New Frontiersmen who are medieval in their outlook. Back in the Middle Ages in our Anglo-Saxon society, it was the king and his court who made all the decisions for the society. I seem to see a striking resemblance between the king and his court and the bunch that are running Washington now.

I don't believe that the American people think that a handful of people in Washington are more capable of making their decisions and ordering their lives and their destinies than they are themselves. I don't believe that the American people believe that the wealth and resources of the country should be marshaled by the Government and redistributed in the form of welfare benefits. I don't believe that the farmers of this country feel that the production of food and fiber should be nationalized. But all of these things have been advocated by the men who surround the President now.

These are perilous times for America. We face the grave threat of Communist imperialism from without. My friends, we also face a threat from within—a very insidious threat—because its false front is a political program that appeals to all that is weak and selfish within us.

I remember Harry Truman campaigning on the platform, "You never had it so good." I know the New Frontier promises to do everything for us. They say, "Here is a crying need and the Federal Government must go in and fulfill that need." I will concede that there are needs in many areas, but the fulfillment of these needs is our responsibility, and historically, as a people, we have, as a free people, disciplined ourselves to do for ourselves the things that need to be done.

I went to church here in Brookings this morning—the Methodist Church. I noticed they have under discussion the possibility of building a new church. There is church building going on all over the United States. I've never seen anything like it—old churches being refurbished. Does the Federal Government tell us we must build churches? Does the Federal Government levy on us and take the money and build churches? No. This to me is proof that the American people, recognizing their spiritual obligations, will do by themselves without any Government intervention the thing that needs to be done. And I think the same thing would apply to education, to roads, to old-age assistance, to almost anything if the Government would just let us alone.

My friends, freedom is a hard-bought thing. You young people have enjoyed the benefits of a free society. I think the reason you are turning conservative is because you realize you may not enjoy them for long. Our American democracy has evolved over a period of centuries—it is not something we have come by overnight, and we must fight now to preserve it because although we have not come by it overnight, we can certainly lose it overnight if we are not careful.

The enemy could lay waste our cities, our factories, and our farms, and in a generation we could rebuild them. But if our free institutions are destroyed, generations yet unborn will live in an absolute state. I want to preserve the blessings of liberty for my three little girls. I know that we all value our liberty. Let's recognize the threat to it, and let's go forth now to resolve that we shall turn them back at the polls in 1962.

New VFW Chief Called Thorough, Man of Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota is proud of Robert E. Hansen, of South St. Paul, Minn., who has been elected national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The following article from the St. Paul Dispatch of August 28 aptly describes his many contributions to his community and his country:

NEW VFW CHIEF CALLED THOROUGH, MAN OF ACTION

(By Carl Hennemann, staff writer)

Robert E. Hansen, the new national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, is a man who likes to get things done the right way.

An insurance man, he operates the Robert E. Hansen agency at 211 Grand Avenue, South St. Paul, where he was born January 28, 1926. He and his wife, Pauline, have two children, Lynda Sue, 9, and Kim Robert, 3. They live at 1711 Pleasant Avenue.

Robert Hansen's friends say he likes to get down to the core of things. This shows up in everything he does—giving youngsters in youth activities a choice of athletics, or scouting around to discover what his community might need most, then getting people to tackle and solve the problem.

He was nominated by his father Chris B. Hansen, also a VFW man; Orville L. Freeman, former governor who is now Secretary of Agriculture, seconded the nomination.

South St. Paul will hold an official Welcome Bob Hansen Day, September 9. Arleigh Burke, retired Chief of Naval Operations, will speak at an official welcoming dinner in Hotel St. Paul the same day.

"I don't think anybody could buy Bob off, after he made up his mind he was doing the right thing," said a friend. "He will want to give the VFW the best he's got. He'll never try to do things lightly, just to get them done."

The VFW chief has held almost every office in his organization, from offices in the Gallagher-Hansen post at South St. Paul to district, State and national posts—he was senior vice commander nationally when elected.

He graduated from South St. Paul High School in 1943, and from the American Aeronautical Institute in St. Paul later, then entered the Navy in March 1944, serving as flight engineer in the Alaska-Aleutian area with naval air transport.

He became an insurance salesman in 1948 and opened his own agency 2 years later.

Some Catholic Opinion on Disarmament—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. William J. Nagle, speaking on behalf of the Catholic Association for International Peace, recently gave broad and thoughtful support for a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. His views (appearing in the Catholic Reporter for August 25), suggests the great urgency of passing legislation to create this agency in this session of Congress before the U.N. debates on disarmament in the fall:

[From the Catholic Reporter, Kansas City, Mo., Aug. 25, 1961]

CATHOLIC PEACE GROUP FOR DISARMAMENT AGENCY BILL

WASHINGTON, D.C.—World tension over the Berlin crisis makes the creation of a U.S. Disarmament Agency more important than ever, a Catholic spokesman told Congress.

The spokesman said that quick congressional action toward coordinating U.S. disarmament efforts would have "a salutary effect on world public opinion" by giving evidence even in a time of crisis American policy is to press for an end to the arms race.

Appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Dr. William J. Nagle spoke on behalf of the Catholic Association for International Peace. He said the CAIP endorses "with enthusiasm" a bill (S. 2180) which would establish the agency.

Nagle is chairman of the association's committee on morality and warfare. He is director of a private research organization and editor of a recent volume of essays dealing with Catholic views on moral problems of modern warfare.

Nagle said the lack of clearcut authority and responsibility for coordination of disarmament policies within the Government has proven a major handicap to our disarmament efforts. A single, central agency would also be able to make more effective use of disarmament studies carried on by university research centers, he said.

Setting forth the CAIP position, Nagle quoted frequently from a column by Norma K. Herzfeld, Washington correspondent for the Catholic Reporter. Mrs. Herzfeld is a former CAIP vice president and former committee secretary for the organization.

Mrs. Herzfeld wrote: "We have kept no more than a handful of experts working—usually part time—on disarmament proposals, implying that we give less importance to this subject on high Government levels than to the matter of startling removal in the District of Columbia."

She said that internal disagreements among the Armed Forces, CIA, Atomic Energy Commission, and the State Department have frequently kept the United States from making important policy decisions, and this at times when agreement seemed possible with Russia.

She charged also that Government authorities have never sought to inform the U.S. public on the meaning of arms, the meaning of arms control, and the degree of our own national sovereignty which would have to be

given up for an enforceable system of inspection and control.

Nagle said the CAIP urges as strongly as it can that Congress pass the bill before the adjournment of the current session.

"Passage of the bill would provide an excellent complement to the President's speech on Berlin and to our present arms buildup. In our concern over Berlin, we must not lose sight of the long-range advantage in world public opinion that would accrue to the United States if we passed the bill creating the Disarmament Agency within the next month."

Utt Family Reunion, Gladesboro Lutheran Church, Carroll County, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 20, 1961, our colleague, the Honorable JAMES B. UTT, and I were guests at the Utt family reunion in Carroll County, Va. The reunion was held at Gladesboro Lutheran Church near Fancy Gap, Va., in the beautiful Blue Ridge Mountains. The occasion was one of wonderful fellowship and we enjoyed a fine picnic dinner and were privileged to hear a comforting sermon, delivered by the Rev. A. F. Tobler. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of Mr. Tobler's sermon:

THE STORMS OF LIFE

Jesus spake unto them saying: Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid.—Matthew 14: 27.

Were you ever in a storm? The disciples of Jesus were once in a storm. The ship was in the midst of the sea of Galilee tossed by the waves—for the wind was contrary. Their Master had just miraculously fed 5,000 hungry souls on five loaves and two fishes. The people were astonished at the miracle. They would have made Him King then and there by force—but He slipped away up into the hills to pray. He wanted to be alone. His throne was not of this world. He had come to reign in the hearts of men—"to seek and to save the lost" to redeem a world lost in sin. He said to His disciples—"Take the boat and cross over to the other side, while I send the multitudes away."

No doubt His disciples were reluctant to leave Him alone. It looked like being disloyal to Him. It seemed like deserting Him. But He had urged them to go—they must obey. Hath not God said: "Behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams?" "Obey My voice and ye shall be My people, his servants ye are to whom ye obey." So His disciples obeyed.

The evening on which His disciples set sail no doubt was fair and lovely. They anticipated a pleasant voyage across the sea of Galilee. But lo, they encountered a violent storm instead. The boat was buffeted and tossed for the wind was adverse.

Is that not a picture of life? All life is like that—storm after storm arises.

How often God's children run into storms when only calm weather is anticipated. How often the brightest beginning ends in gloom. How often the finest day is followed by storms. How often the morning sun is blacked out by storms by noonday. How,

often our dearest treasures are snatched away without warning—and our fairest hopes blighted and instead of mirth there is mourning.

But do not sailors expect to encounter storms at sea? Do they not carry life preservers and life boats?

How foolish it would be to put to sea and not to be prepared for gales and storms and contrary winds. Life is not all sunshine; storms arise.

And so on this day—suddenly the songs of the sailors cease. The favorable breeze becomes a mighty wind. The calm sea rolls and writhes—it becomes a thing of fury. The sailors are alarmed. The ship is being tossed—the disciples struggle and toll against the angry wind and waves. Their lives are in danger. It is dark. It is night. Their Master is away. They are alone. They seem so helpless.

Is this not a fit representation of our life? Contrary winds, darkness, perils, storms. And oftentimes even Jesus our refuge and strength seems far away—just when we need Him most.

How stormy life is. These stormy gales and winds of life come to all of us. Bitter disappointments. Grievous losses. Perplexing cares. Anxious apprehensions. Pinching poverty. Temptations. Cutting words. Painful diseases. Darkness. Death. O what black clouds arise. What whirlwinds of storms. How tempest tossed we are.

Are not tests and trials like storms to be expected? If the disciples of Jesus escaped not but were storm tossed—shall we escape? Are we better than they? "Are there no foes for me to face, must I not stem the flood?"

From His place of prayer on the mountain side, through the darkness of the night Jesus was keeping watch. His disciples might think He was far away, yet He was near.

His disciples must have looked out across those wind-swept waves toward the hills from whence must come their help, still hoping that somehow Jesus would come to their aid. It is always darker just before the dawn. Truly, this was a dark hour for the disciples. They needed Jesus so much, death was so near, they could almost touch it. They were so afraid. Then just when they needed Him most, Jesus came to their rescue. He came walking on the angry waves. They saw Him, but they thought it was ghost—they were now alarmed more than ever.

But above the wind and the raging sea they hear a voice. It is the voice of Jesus. Across the waves He calls: "Be of good cheer, it is I, be not afraid." What comforting words.

So in our trials, tests and troubles—in our sorrows and disappointments we need to remember that Jesus is always near. He has promised, "Lo I am with you alway." In every calamity we are not alone. He speaks to us just as truly as He spoke to His disciples long ago. Across the ages His Word comes to us: "Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." "It is I," involves everything.

To His disciples His voice was a familiar voice. They had heard it often. It was a voice of authority, of sympathy, of love, of comfort and security. It was the voice of power. All power is His. He held heaven and earth in His hand. They heard His voice and obeyed His will.

Not only was He able to calm the raging sea and the advance wind—but He was able to calm the troubled spirit of His beloved disciples.

The disciples recognized His voice. And when the waves and the wind grew calm they were ready to cry out: "Of a truth Thou art the Son of God."

So with us, we must recognize His voice as He speaks to us through His word and through His church. We must confess our

sins and accept Him as our divine saviour and redeemer. He is the way, the truth and the life. He is the only way.

I'm sure the disciples remembered how Jesus would not send the hungry multitudes away until He had satisfied their hunger. And in their distress believed that He would find a way to help them in this awful storm.

We, too, need to remember that no soul ever came to Jesus for help and went empty away. In these turbulent days, in these stormy times in which we live—when so many dangers threaten us from every angle of life, we, too, need to Hear and Heed the Voice of Jesus. It is only when Jesus is with us that we feel perfectly safe—only then are we safe.

God does not tempt us—but He does test us to try our faith—to test our loyalty and our love.

The Apostle Paul says: "We are to glory in tribulation, knowing that tribulation, worketh patience, patience experience, experience hope, hope maketh not afraid or ashamed, because the love of God is shed in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given us."

Jesus was tested and tried. He knows all about us. He knows how frail we are. He knows there are adverse winds and that storm clouds arise.

He faced the storm. He was hungry and weary. He was despised and rejected. He was deserted, denied, betrayed and crucified. The wind never blew so hard as that dark night in Gethsemane, when He sweated great drops of blood in agony. No night was ever so dark. No load so heavy—never was agony so great as on that Good Friday when Jesus died on the cross, to pay the debt for the sins of the world, to pay the debt for you, for me.

Yet as he faced the cross only a few hours before His crucifixion, with a shout of triumph He was able to say to His disciples: "In this world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."

We, too, can overcome the world, and sin with all its trials and troubles and tribulations through Christ Jesus and only through Him can we win the victory.

No matter how dark the night or how great the loss, or how heavy the load, or how contrary the wind, or how severe the test—remember that Jesus is always near—ready, willing, and able to save to the uttermost. Remember that His grace is sufficient for every human need.

"How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord,

Is laid for your faith in His excellent word. What more can He say, than to you He hath said,

To you who for refuge to Jesus have fled? Hide me, O my Saviour, hide, Till the storm of life is past."

Hon. Eugene J. Keogh

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 30, 1961

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to join in the tribute to a great Congressman, EUGENE J. KEOGH, on his birthday and his 25th anniversary of dedicated service to his country.

GENE KEOGH has an enviable record and has been and is an inspiration to me, a new Member of the House. It is my privilege to represent a district which many years ago was also represented by my distinguished colleague. To this day fine words of praise are echoed by many of my constituents for the great services rendered by him.

To you, GENE, go my very best wishes for continued good health, happiness, and many more years of service to your district, State, and Nation.

Dr. Wangenstein's Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the great medical men of the world today is Dr. Owen H. Wangenstein, professor and chairman of the Department of Surgery at the University of Minnesota School of Medicine. His contributions to medical science are well described in the following article from the *Journal of the American Medical Association* of August 26, 1961:

DR. WANGENSTEIN'S CONTRIBUTION

(By Leonard W. Larson, M.D.,
Bismarck, N. Dak.)

The honor roll of doctors in medical science and research, who have received the Passano Foundation Award since 1945, represents 16 outstanding careers which have been of immeasurable value to humanity. As further evidence of the distinction of their developments and discoveries, five winners also have received the Nobel Prize. Each new name added to this honor roll gives recognition and appreciation to another of those individuals who can, through his own ability, spirit, and vision, pass on to others the knowledge and inspiration needed to help solve our present-day problems, and hasten the promise of tomorrow.

Such a man is Dr. Owen H. Wangenstein, professor and chairman of the Department of Surgery at the University of Minnesota School of Medicine. I consider it a privilege to add his name to the honor roll as the 17th recipient of the Passano Award for his many contributions to surgical techniques and postoperative care of the patient. Perhaps his finest contribution to medicine, however, is the number of exceptional proteges he has prepared to occupy positions of honor, and to make their own impressive contributions. But Dr. Wangenstein's own words best express what I consider to be his most outstanding contribution to medicine. He said, "In the final analysis, the only real gift in life is a part of oneself."

For over 30 years, Dr. Wangenstein has been giving the gift of a generous part of himself to medicine, reluctantly at first because he did not want to be a doctor; he wanted to be a farmer. But his reluctance, which I suspect was really only Norwegian persistence—sometimes known as Scandinavian stubbornness—was aimed at the Norwegian persistence of his father who kept after him to enter medicine. They saw eye to eye finally, and tonight we are honoring both the ability of one Wangenstein,

and the judgment of another for a lifetime dedication to what the doctor modestly terms, "only extending our knowledge a little bit." But, remember, a key is a small item, yet it has opened doors leading to vast treasure.

In addition to his father's insistence, there were two other influences which led to his medical career. While still in high school, he showed skill and resourcefulness in solving a farm problem of sows that could not farrow their young. He did research in the *Breeders' Gazette*, the *Farmer*, and several books on veterinary problems. He unsuccessfully tried a mechanical device. Finally, he found that his hand was the best instrument to deliver pigs. His father was impressed and pleased. The other occurrence involved hauling manure every day for about 3 weeks during a summer hot spell. Anything, he became convinced, would be better than that.

Dr. Wangenstein's gift of himself to medicine comes to us in many forms. His contribution to growing excellence in medical education stems from his dedication and strength in protecting and expanding the atmosphere for academic research. This atmosphere, alive now in Minnesota because of facilities and standards which he established, is being carried on into the world by graduates who owe their outlooks and enthusiasm to that atmosphere. Who can tell the immeasurable benefit which our Nation has received and will receive from this fountainhead. Dr. Wangenstein has an explanation for this successful atmosphere. He says, "I found that you've got to take a stand and stick to it." He also says, "Success in any endeavor, each of us comes to know, is an enterprise of a lifetime. It is a heavy and recurring responsibility."

His lifetime endeavor has nurtured a postgraduate research program which has paid off handsomely. Among Dr. Wangenstein's proteges are eight recipients of the John and Mary Markle scholarship. Many former Minnesota residents now occupy key posts in teaching hospitals throughout the country.

The most celebrated reward of Dr. Wangenstein's stick-to-it-iveness is the recent pioneering efforts in cardiovascular surgery. Former Resident Dr. Clarence Dennis originated one of the early pump oxygenators. Dr. F. John Lewis, now of Northwestern University, was the first to employ hypothermia successfully in open-heart surgery. Dr. C. Walton Lillehei was among the first to perform open-heart operations assisted by cardiopulmonary bypass. His pump oxygenator was devised by Dr. Richard DeWall, chief resident on Dr. Wangenstein's service.

Dr. Wangenstein himself has devised surgical procedures which are credited with playing an important role in reducing operative mortality in many kinds of abdominal surgery. His procedures in cancer surgery have made it possible to salvage 10 percent of otherwise hopeless gastric cancer patients, and 25 percent in cases of advanced cancers of the colon. His most recent innovation is the use of hypothermia to control severe gastric bleeding which has made surgery feasible, or in some cases entirely unnecessary, for patients with severely hemorrhagic duodenal ulcers.

On behalf of myself and the American Medical Association, I say that again you have chosen wisely in honoring a truly outstanding man. Over a year ago, Dr. Wangenstein said about one of his friends: "We need his example far more than he needs our praise." Tonight, I give the doctor back his own words. We need his example as we need his influence to continue the advance of medical knowledge through the chain reaction of learning, and of medical practice through the strength of dedication.

Some Catholic Opinion on Disarmament—

III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the following article gives an indication of the solid feeling that many American Catholics have for disarmament. Mr. Donald McDonald's thoughtful piece, which appeared in the *Pittsburgh Catholic* of August 24, is not only a cogently written argument, but an index of the broad support this legislation has. I hope that other Members may be as favorably impressed by it as I was:

[From the *Pittsburgh Catholic*, Aug. 24, 1961]

U.S. DISARMAMENT AGENCY

(By Donald McDonald)

It may seem incredible, but it has taken our country 16 years—from the dropping of the first atomic bomb until now—to create a special, permanent agency for disarmament, thereby serving notice on the world that we propose to make a sustained, organized and systematic effort leading to eventual universal disarmament.

The agency has not yet been established. But the necessary legislation has been introduced by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Representative THOMAS E. MORAN, of Pennsylvania. It has bipartisan support and seems assured of passage if the House can make room for it in the crowded, closing weeks of this session of Congress.

For 16 years the disarmament problem has been treated by both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations in a spasmodic, haphazard manner. It has at times been oversimplified, at other times distorted (e.g., certain propagandists have persistently deceived the American people by pretending that all American advocates of disarmament favor unilateral disarmament by the United States which would indeed, if true, be a foolish and dangerous position.)

At one time, Mr. Eisenhower (or was it Sherman Adams?) found a little office in the White House for Harold Stassen and installed him as the Nation's disarmament expert. But when Mr. Stassen began delving into some of the ramifications of disarmament and began seriously negotiating with Russia, Britain, and France in London, his job and his office were dissolved.

This is not, mind you, a matter of the disarmament sincerity of Mr. Eisenhower or the late John Foster Dulles, or of Mr. Truman who accomplished little more.

The deficiency, I think, has not been one of sincerity, but rather of imagination and intellectual power, together with conviction and confidence that what must be done—i.e., universal disarmament and the establishing of world peace and world order—can be done.

All of these qualities of mind and heart must be present in any President and his administration if they are to overcome the inherent difficulty in disarmament—that is, the formidable psychological task of mounting and sustaining total disarmament effort at the same time that the Nation must be totally committed, for sheer survival reasons, to an all-out armament program.

What a nation can accomplish in disarmament planning and negotiating is related, of course, to the climate of public opinion in the country. But the government itself can influence that public opinion, for or against